THE EXAMINER.

No. 668. SUNDAY, OCT. 15, 1820.

THE POLITICAL EXAMINER.

Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few. POPE.

No. 653.

SUBJECT OF THE QUEEN'S DEFENCE, RESUMED.

In resuming our observations on the evidence for the QUEEN, we find we have a word or two more to say on those very undone witnesses, *Majocchi*, *Sacchi*, and *Demont*. And first of the always first. If there is any difference whatsoever between the credibility of the uneducated Italian witnesses and the better educated English ones (and we shall shew how much there is presently), *Majocchi* is proved to have told WILLIAM CARRINGTON, 1st, that the KING's Hanoverian Minister at Rome, *Baron Ompteda*, employed someboby to get the key belonging to the PRINCESS's room at Como, in order to have a false one made from it:—2. That the person employed had confessed it, and been turned away:—3. That he, and all the household, were shocked at the Baron's having behaved so ungratefully after having so long eaten and drank at the house of the PRINCESS:—And 4. That if the PRINCESS would have allowed him, he would have beaten and killed the Baron in the open streets, like a dog.—*Theodore*, it seems, now looks pale and dejected; and *sighs* when he repeats his *Non mi ricordo*, like AMBROGETTI in a tragi-comedy.

Sacchi, alias *Sacchini*, alias *Count Milani*, alias *Signor Innominabile*.—Mr. WILLIAMS was as good as his word, and brought forward the Courier, who really occupied the post, which according to *Sacchi* had enabled himself to make his memorable observation. He swears that *Sacchi* had set out two hours before the rest of the suit in a hired carriage, for the purpose of getting the relays of horses; that he himself, CARLO FORTE, was the real courier who rode by the carriages; and moreover that the Countess OLDI sat between the PRINCESS and BERGAMI during the whole of the journey.

Mr. WILLIAMS was equally inexorable in keeping his promises respecting the next witness *Mademoiselle Demont*, alias the *Countess Colombier*, alias *Double Entendre*. It is hard, we must allow, even upon the fair Double, and still harder upon JOHN WHITCOMB, (whether her greater ingratitude has provoked him or not) for the latter to be obliged to come forward and "tell" upon oath. But so it is.

When you have been in that room, has Mademoiselle Demont been there also?—Yes, always; it was she who generally invited me to go there. (This is too savage!)

Were any other persons present on those occasions?—Yes, sometimes Kress, who was commonly called Annette; but she seldom remained long after I entered the room.

Then you have frequently been alone in the room with Demont?—Yes, very frequently.

At the times when you have been so alone with Demont, has the door been locked or not?—Yes, it has been locked and bolted. (*A laugh.*)

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL here interfered. He said, that the object of this course of examination must be evident to their Lordships, and surely no argument was necessary to shew that it was illegitimate.

Mr. DENMAN.—My Lords, we will not pursue it.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—You have pushed it as far as you possibly could. (*A laugh.*)

Adieu, *Ma'amselle Demont*, ingrate Double Entendre!

The interview with Adam and Eve.—It is the same with this "antediluvian scene" as Mr. WILLIAMS called it. He promised to bring a man who should swear that it was impossible for *Ragazzoni* to see from the place he spoke of; and he has done so, in the person of SANTINO GUGGIERI, the overseer of the workmen.

Ask the witness whether the workmen at work in the octagon room could see the statues of Adam and Eve where they are, and where they are placed in the drawing?—They could not.

Why?—Because the passage is crooked, and prevents the sight.

Ask him whether the statues of Adam and Eve ever stood in any other room in the grotto, besides that in which he says the statues were placed?—They were not.

But then, says the *Courier*, if you don't believe one Italian, you are bound not to believe another. We will discuss that matter presently. Meanwhile, the *Courier* may, if he pleases, take *Majocchi's* credibility to be as good as his own.

BERGAMI's general manners; the Kisses, &c. Enough has been proved on this subject already, to shew that BERGAMI was not the vulgar person he was described to be: and so there has on the other points. But there are persons always calling for more. Now *every* body, except the hired and uneducated evidence that were first brought forward, agrees in describing his behaviour as attentive to all, much superior to that of a common servant, and most respectful to the QUEEN. We know of no exception to it but that of the phrase "Some drink, Madam," when he rode up to the coach; and this depends upon the tone and manner in which the request was put. If it was put humbly, or in a tone of deferential privilege, asking it as an ordinary favour though still *as* a favour, it might only become an additional evidence of the judicious and pleasant manner in which he bore his good fortune. No witnesses, but the Cotton-garden ones, know any thing of the fondling on the gun; none ever saw him kiss her; none ever saw him, or supposed him, guilty of the least disrespectfulness. Nobody was even jealous of the honours conferred on him, his conduct was so subdued and conciliating. He was rather more reserved then Italians in his situation are apt to be; but this was from the first, and is an evidence of his natural superiority to it. He shewed that superiority in no other way. One of the greatest compliments that could be paid to any reduced man of good family was paid to him, by a servant who was unconscious how far he went. It is in SICARD's examination.

Did you consider him too much of a gentleman for his condition?—Not exactly; for *he was not ab ve his business.* (*A laugh.*) He always did what was required of him,

With respect to his sleeping in the tent, which is acknowledged, it was either a proper or improper thing, according as it originated and was managed. It is impossible to judge of the custom of other countries by our own, or rather by those of our own times; for as a correspondent of the *Chronicle* has justly observed, even in the days of the *Spectator*, manners were very different with regard to the seasons and places in which men and women might be

found together: and of SHAKSPEARE's time it is sufficient, on this head, to say, that the *Merry Wives of Windsor* was written to please a maiden queen. Besides, travellers of the most scrupulous nature are often reduced to strange shifts for convenience and security: and after all, we repeat, that it depends upon the way in which the inner economy of the tent was managed, whether the PRINCESS is to have been thought too careless of her "reputation." Upon the whole, the more we see of this matter, the more we are convinced that the PRINCESS was justified in having a trust-worthy person as often with her as possible; and for our own parts, the more we hear of BERGAMI's character and conduct, the less *are*, for one, should be inclined to think her guilty, in the highest and truest court of morality, had she felt for him a tenderer sensation.

The Dining.—"A courier to a person of rank," says Colonel TIEUILLE, (who remembered BERGAMI as a Quarter-Master and a good soldier) "is not looked upon as a servant." The Colonel seemed impatient of the repeated questions to him, and well he might. "They conduct *these* matters," at any rate, "better in France:" and what the French think of our Vilain-ton and our "great moral lessons" by this time, Heaven only knows. But to resume. Instead of making our eternal egotistical mistakes about customs that differ from our own, we might do well to take a "moral lesson" from the PRINCESS's kindness, and learn how to be friends with those whom we find real friends to us, and not exclusively with those who are as well dressed. The race of servants is hurt and made sullen in the long run by arrogant or unaffectionate treatment, and improved by the reverse. It is one of the most unpleasant things in English families, that they so often complain of their servants. The same complaints are not made on the continent. But our servants, it may be said, deserve it. Indeed! What *our* servants! *English* servants! right earnest John Bull servants! It is an extraordinary concession. But whose business is it to make them better? Who should begin teaching and improving first? We can speak to the foreign customs in this particular ourselves, and to a very eminent English understanding which thought it not beneath it to adopt them. We have sat at the tea-table of a man of family in company with a foreign nursery-maid, whose manners, though she was never any thing higher, and not different from those of others of her rank, quite warranted her admittance to it.

The Balls.—It turns out that these entertainments were given purposely and exclusively to the household, and to neighbours in their own rank of life. The PRINCESS "was not constantly in the dancing room, but chiefly in an adjoining room, and came to see the dance occasionally." Thus the very fault that was found with them, shews their character. They were cheerful pieces of kindness shewn to those about her; and her natural tendency to enjoy the sight of happiness in others led her to mingle in them; oftener, very likely, than most Princesses would do.

The Acting.—The PRINCESS, it seems, among other theatricals, performed the part of an *automaton*.

What do you mean by the part of an automaton?—The story was (but it is so long ago that I hardly recollect it) that of a man who wanted to sell an automaton, a woman that might be wound up to any thing, in which the purchaser was disappointed. It was a story of her Royal Highness's composing.

Did not the performance consist in buying and selling an automaton?—Yes.

What did the automaton do, sit, walk, ride, or what?—Her Royal Highness was standing in a box.

Do you conceive that such an amusement was consonant to the high dignity of a royal personage?—I could not enter into her Royal Highness's mind, but I did not think her conduct derogatory, knowing the pleasure which she takes in that sort of entertainment.

Well said, Lieutenant HOWNAM. When a pleasure is innocent, the spirit with which it is entered into makes all the difference between propriety and degradation. The question was not so wise as the answer. Such amusements have been entered into by royal personages, before whom very Learned Gentlemen and great Lords have thought themselves honoured in bowing down to the ground; albeit the conduct of all of them was not quite "correct." The late celebrated Empress of RUSSIA acted in little dramatic Proverbs, which were also of her own composition; and HENRIETTA, Queen of England, and wife of the super-legitimate CHARLES the First, who was nevertheless a man of good taste and decency, represented characters in the Masques of that period. If the PRINCESS, by the way, really wrote this little drama of the Automaton, it gives one an advantageous idea of her natural wit, which is a thing that nobody expects now-a-days in a legitimate person. The woman who is to be made an automaton of, and who turns out to be something not quite so convenient, is a very good and significant idea, and must have highly amused the Italian gentlemen who took a part in it; for among the actors, it appears, were a Chevalier and a Professor.

BERGAMI's Mimicry.—Much was inquired, it will be recollected, respecting BERGAMI acting some part, for which he stuffed himself out with a bolster. Lieut. HOWNAM explains this very readily:—

Be so good as to state the occasion of that circumstance?—It was in derision of the English Consul at Jaffa, who came on board with a long Greek robe, a gold-laced cocked hat, and a gold-headed cane.

Was he a pompous figure, this Consul?—He was.

Credibility or otherwise of the Witnesses.—Lieutenant HOWNAM is one of the gentlemen who depose to the prevailing decency of the PRINCESS's and BERGAMI's conduct; and Lieutenant FLYNN is another. It is amusing to see the national vanity of the *Courier* reduced to the necessity of upholding the character of acknowledged Italian traitors of the menial order, and doing all it can to lower that of respectable Italians and of officers of it's own country. The two Lieutenants, as well as all who appear for the QUEEN, are subjected to cross-examinations of the most tiresome and preposterous length; and because they do *not* take refuge from the liability to forgetfulness and inconsistency on minor points, in the sweeping *Non mi ricordos* of *Master Majocchi*, *therefore* they are to be no better than he,—nay, worse! Such is the voluntary humiliation to which the habits of a corrupt party can reduce the human mind. We all know for what *Majocchi* and others came forward; and they acted accordingly, with a desperate wilfulness of memory, and an equally desperate wilfulness of forgetting. The witnesses for the QUEEN, (who, observe, were not called upon by the other side) come forward to support, instead of betray, a woman and a kind patroness. They naturally feel a wish to shew a careless contempt for minute enquiry, and yet an affectionate zeal for one whose hospitality they partook so long; and granting yet for the sake of argument that any one of them may not be so respectable a person as he might be, this mingled feeling, united with a long, tedious, and ridiculously minute examination, is alone sufficient to account for the petty inconsistencies into which a man might be led, especially an over-sensitive and nervous one, like Lieutenant FLYNN. Compare the spirit of these inconsistencies with that of the all-on-one-side memories and non-memories of *Majocchi*, and the professed double meanings of *Demont*. Supposing even, that a gentleman could possibly get himself into the dreadful situation of being consciously perjured, still, even then, and we say it out of a horror of what constitutes crime instead of the reverse, there would be a great difference, in the eyes of any truly virtuous human being, between the inhuman and voluntary wretch who perjured himself in order to be rewarded for betraying his kind mistress, and the involuntary one who could not find it in his heart to tell even the truth against her. But the case, on the face of it, is totally different, without resorting to any such far-fetched suppositions as these.

The Dance of MAHOMET.—Upon this Mussulman subject, we may pass over the evidence of every previous

gentleman who knows any thing of the matter, and come to that of GRANVILLE SHARPE, Esq. who was in the India service ten or eleven years. It is to be observed that the dance performed by MAHOMET was first proved to be the common Eastern dance, which so many travellers have seen, and of which we have all read. Mr. SHARPE deposes that he has seen it danced in the Government House at Calcutta, before the Marquis of HASTINGS, the Marchioness, the Bishop of Calcutta, and several other ladies, including the Bishop's wife.

I need not therefore ask if there was any indecency? *(A laugh.)*—Certainly there was no indecency.

And it is the common Moorish dance?—Yes, it is.

The question respecting this dance is one proof, among many, of the ignorant self-love with which some people judge of the customs of other countries by their own. An old Spaniard, who approved of the Inquisition, would have shuddered to see an Englishman drunk. The grossest and most mercenary Englishman, who scrapes money together, and eats and drinks himself stupid, shall affect to talk against the morals of the South for thinking so lightly of gallantry. We are shocked at the familiarity of the French and Italians with their servants; and the French and Italians are shocked at our hauteur. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, who if he does not represent the KING on this occasion, represents the most narrow-minded and ignorant of his MAJESTY's subjects, wonders even that the PRINCESS should go to a masquerade privately,—that is to say, should go privately to a place, where it is the nature of the entertainment to affect privacy. It is the same with this Eastern dance. Nobody at the West end of the town thinks it indecent to witness the dances at the Opera; and yet we would not undertake to say, that the very persons who perform the Eastern dances, might not be scandalized at those. If the first consist of suspicious movements of the body, the latter deviate into equally surprising vagaries of the legs. Nay, we may say, still more surprising: for movements of the body are more or less inevitable at all times; but a female in most countries, our own among them, is thought bound to keep her legs in good contact. Now what is the case at the Opera? What pair of compasses ever took remoter leave of each other, than legs do there? What would a Turk who covers up his women from head to foot, and thinks it indelicate in a man to behold their chins,—what would he think of seeing a female almost transparently habited in short clothes, whisking them round in a continued whirl so as to shew more than her legs and knees, and then elevating one of the former at right angles, and looking attractively at the side boxes? Imagine this done for the first time, before our own eyes. What should we think of it?—Well: what, it may be asked, did the PRINCESS think of the Eastern dance, when performed before her for the first time?—Something like what you, the questioner, very probably think of the Opera dance at any time. The PRINCESS, who is a woman of a lively heart and fancy, was very likely reminded of thoughts, which you, the real soul of indelicacy, would drag before a formal tribunal. But if she was, there are other ladies, Governors, and even Bishops, it seems, to countenance the hazard; and yet far be it from us to call in question the natural delicacy of the Marchioness of HASTINGS or Dr. MIDDLETON. A festive occasion is not a trial. A tolerant good-nature is not a loathsome and hypocritical impertinence. In all the canvassing of this question, and indeed in the whole of the trial, the hypocrisy, to us, is infinitely the most disgusting feature. Even those whom we do not suspect of a worse hypocrisy, are, and must be, and must know each other to be, hypocrites to a certain extent; or their own love-making must be a still more formal and contradictory thing then we take it for. As to the dancing, the truth is, that all dancing is a representation of courtship or war; that the Lords and others, who go to the Opera to enjoy the sight of it, know it or feel it to be so; that the Opera mode of dancing is at the same time not thought indelicate by some, any more than the Eastern mode is by others; and lastly, that nevertheless a certain understanding on the subject, more or less graceful according to the nature and good taste of the spectator, is present to the minds of those who witness either. And yet, after all this, the Opera visitors shall go and sit in judgment on a discarded female, condescend to examine acknowledged traitors her servants, ask for cold and nauseous explanations, that are made nauseous by the asking, and perpetrate enquiries like a pack of scandalous old washerwomen, into——For GOD's sake let's go to some other subject.

☞

A HINT FOR ROYALTY.

"The person given to us by Monk was a man without any sense of his duty as a prince—without any regard to the dignity of his crown—without any love to his people: dissolute, false, venal, and destitute of any positive good quality whatsoever, except a pleasant temper, and the manners of a gentleman."—*Burke's Works*, Vol. 6. p. 456.

Such is Burke's character of Charles 2d; yet even Charles, when the infamous perjured witnesses of the day endeavoured to implicate the Queen in the Popish Plot, could not be induced to countenance so atrocious a conspiracy. "They think I have a mind to a new wife," said he, "but for all that I will not see an innocent woman abused."—*North's Examen*, p. 186.

Lincoln's-Inn, Oct. 10.

UNITED PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, Oct. 9.

THE QUEEN'S DEFENCE.—(CONTINUED.)

ELEVENTH WITNESS.

Dr. Henry Holland was called and examined by Mr. Wilde. He deposed, that he was her Majesty's medical attendant for ten months—leaving England with her, and quitting her service, on account of his private affairs, at Venice. His salary ceased within 15 months of that period, and he has never had any pension or equivalent since. At Naples, he frequently dined with her Majesty, at Genoa always. Bergami waited at table. The Princess was visited by the most distinguished persons, English and Italians, both at Venice and Genoa. Her demeanour towards Bergami was always that of a mistress towards her domestic, and that of Bergami towards the Princess was perfectly unpresuming and respectful. There never was any thing in the conduct of her Royal Highness at all indecent, immodest, or improper—never any thing calculated to bring disgrace upon this country. His favourable opinion of her Royal Highness had never undergone a change.

Dr. Holland underwent a very long cross-examination by the Solicitor-General, but he did not swerve in the smallest degree from any thing he had previously stated; nor did he depose to a single circumstance that would make against the Queen.—In his re-examination, he said, that the Princess's house at Genoa, though in the suburbs, was in a conspicuous situation, and conveniently situated for receiving visitors. He also stated, that he had never been examined respecting the Princess, nor ever asked for his testimony. In the examination by the Peers, Dr. Holland, in explaining that the Princess's manner to Bergami did not differ from her manner to her other principal servants, begged to remark, that her demeanour to all her servants was "extremely affable and familiar."

TWELFTH WITNESS.

Charles Mills, Esq. was examined by Mr. Denman. He stated, that he saw the Princess of Wales at Rome in 1817, having had the honour of her acquaintance before she left England. She was visited by people of the highest rank (witness named several), and treated with the distinction due to a royal personage. Bergami then dined with her Royal Highness as her Chamberlain.

Did you often see her Royal Highness and her Chamberlain Bergami together?—Frequently.

Did you ever see the smallest impropriety of conduct between them?—Never.

Does this answer apply to your observation of the Princess and Bergami, as well at Rome as at other places?—Yes, certainly.

Do you recollect passing any time at Pesaro in the year 1819?—I do.

Do you recollect on that occasion calling at the Princess's Villa at Pesaro?—Yes, I do; I called there on my return from Venice.

How long did you remain there?—About two days. The Princess was from home when I called first. On her Royal Highness's return home she sent a carriage for me, with one of her equerries and William Austin, to desire my attendance at the Villa on that evening.

How long did you remain on that visit?—I arrived at the house between seven and eight o'clock in the evening, stayed for supper, and after that returned to sleep at the inn.

Did you pay your respects to her Royal Highness on the following day?—Yes, her Royal Highness sent her carriage, with one of her equerries, to show me whatever was worth seeing in the neighbourhood of Pesaro.

Did you, after seeing the country, wait on the Princess at the Villa?—Yes, I did.

Did you then dine with her Royal Highness?—Yes; I dined and spent the evening with the Princess; and, after walking about the grounds with her Royal Highness, I wished to go to see the fair of Sinigaglia, that being the last day of the fair. I accordingly quitted her Royal Highness, and went there.

The witness proceeded to state, that, in February, 1820, after George the Third's death was known in Italy, witness saw her Majesty again at Rome: all marks of public honour were withdrawn, but persons of distinction still paid their respects to her. Bergami always behaved towards her Majesty with the utmost respect: never did witness see any thing in their conduct towards each other derogatory to the dignity of the British empire, or calculated to wound the moral feelings of the people; nor could any just exception be taken to her Majesty's acts, either public or private.

[Nothing of the slightest importance was elicited in cross-examination.]

Examined by the Peers.—Witness considered the manners of the Countess Oldi as natural and unobtrusive, and as not at all different from those of other Italian ladies: her accent Lombard, but her Italian good.

THIRTEENTH WITNESS.

Colonel Theoline was examined. As nothing inconsistent was elicited in cross-examination, we give the substance of his deposition at once:—Witness was formerly on the Staff of Prince Eugene, is Chevalier of the Iron Crown, and of the Legion of Honour. He was acquainted with Bergami in 1801. Bergami was then Quarter-master (*Maréchal de Loges*) in the 1st Italian Hussars, composing part of a brigade commanded by the brother of the witness—a General of Division under the Viceroy. Bergami's conduct was irreproachable—that of a good military man, known to be received at the evening parties of General Galemberti. In 1808 Bergami was in Spain, the confidential courier of Gen. Pino—much trusted by the General, and esteemed by every body as an honest man. The place of courier is *not considered that of a domestic*, when held in the service *of a person of rank*.

FOURTEENTH WITNESS.

Carlo Forti was examined by Mr. Brougham. He stated, that he was in the service of the Princess of Wales, as courier, in 1817; previous to which he was chief courier of the capital to the Viceroy of Italy. He is the nephew of the Duchess of Polegnia, the wife of an eminent banker at Rome. He remembered the Princess travelling by night (on account of the heat) from Rome to Sinigaglia *. Her Royal Highness travelled in an English landauler, with Venetian blinds, incapable of being opened except by pressing the springs from the inside of the carriage. The Queen sat on the right side of the vehicle, Baron Bergami on the left, and the Countess Oldi between them, during the whole journey, of three nights' travelling. This witness was the *only* courier attending the Queen on that journey, never leaving the carriage, except just half a mile before entering each post station. Sacchi *never rode on horseback at all* the whole way from Sinigaglia—never was near the carriage at all—regularly setting out in a carriage two hours before the Queen, to provide and pay for horses, and never seeing or being seen by any one of the party until the night's journey was concluded.

Did you ever see the Baron Bergami kiss her Royal Highness at any time during the journey, or at any other time?—I never saw him.

Did you ever see the Baron take leave of her Royal Highness on any occasion?—I have.

What did he do?—He kissed her hand; nothing else.

Did you yourself ever, on taking leave of her Royal Highness, kiss her hand in the same manner?—Yes, I have.

Did any other members of her Royal Highness's suite do the same thing?—Yes; her Equerries and Chamberlains, and all the Gentlemen who came to visit her.

Were you in the practice of kissing the hands of former persons of rank with whom you served as courier?—I did so to the Vice Queen of Italy, as well as to the Empress Josephine.

Cross-examined.—Bergami's wife lived at Milan as such. Witness once carried a letter from Bergami to her. Luigi Bergami, Bernardo Bergami, Francisco Bergami, and Faustina, were in the service of her Royal Highness.

By Lord Erskine.—Witness *never* observed any thing improper or indecent in the conduct of her Royal Highness towards Bergami, or towards any other person. Bergami always spoke to her with much respect.

FIFTEENTH WITNESS.

Lieutenant John Flynn was sworn. He stated, that he was a Lieutenant in the Royal Navy. At Messina, in November, 1813, the Princess of Wales gave him the command of a polacre, which was hired to convey her Royal Highness and suite to Constantinople and elsewhere. At Tunis, Bergami's bed-room was changed from the after-cabin to the dining-room. He knew the situation of the bed-rooms of the Princess and Bergami during the whole voyage.

I wish to know whether, at any time, in the situation in which the beds of those two individuals were placed, it was possible for them to see one another while in bed?—I say, no (emphatically.)

It was Garguilo's duty, as master of the ship, to take orders from witness, to whom they were communicated by her Royal Highness. He had no business to go to the Princess's apartments, unless he had orders from witness. Witness recollected the tent in which her Royal Highness slept on deck; a passage was left on one side of it at night. A light was sometimes put under that tent, but it was afterwards taken away, because it was represented to her Royal Highness that the pirates in the Mediterranean rendered it unsafe. There was a communication from the tent by a ladder into the dining-room below, which was kept open at night. *The bathing-tub used by the Princess was too large to be placed in her cabin.** Witness never saw the Princess sitting on a gun. He never saw her sitting in the lap, or putting her arms round the neck of any person, or kissing any body except perhaps the child Victorine.

During the whole time you had the management of this vessel, and the Princess was on board, did you see the slightest impropriety or indecency in her behaviour towards Bergami or towards any other person?—No.

Witness remembered Bergami's going to Terracina: on taking leave he kissed the hand of the Princess, which was done by all on taking leave.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.—Witness thought they were about a month on the voyage from Jaffa to Syracuse. Being very sharply questioned as to "whether he was sure it was not more," &c. he said that on reflection he thought it more likely to be two months; but that he could tell by looking to some memorandums, which were copies of parts of a journal which he kept during the voyage in question. The original was at home in Sicily. [After some debate, he was allowed to refer to these memorandums, when it appeared that the voyage lasted from the 18th July to the 20th August.] Witness did not think that from the bed of Bergami in the dining-room, any one could see the bed of the Princess in her cabin; but he never stood at Bergami's bed to see. Under the tent on the deck, there was a bed as well as a sofa: witness believed the bed was William Austin's. The Princess slept on the sofa. Witness never saw any one sleeping in the bed; but he had seen it used to sit on in the day time. He had seen Bergami so sit on it; but he had never seen him lie on it. Witness did not know where Bergami slept during the voyage from Jaffa to Syracuse (the period during which the tent was up); but he believed he did *not* sleep in the tent.

What is your reason for believing that he did not sleep in the tent?—Because, when I went to see her Majesty, I did not see any one there.

Was it light or dark?—It was dark. (*Laughter.*)

Going in then only when it was dark, and not seeing him there in the dark, do you mean to say he was not there?—The light from the binnacle was sufficient to give me an opportunity of seeing whether he was there or not: the light of the binnacle shone in at the place where I opened the tent.

You mean to swear that if he had been there you must have seen him?—Yes.—Adjourned.

* This is the journey on which Sacchi described the indecent exhibition to have taken place.

* A complete contradiction of one of the stories against the Queen.

Tuesday, Oct. 10.

PROSECUTIONS FOR PERJURY.

Earl Grosvenor said their Lordships would recollect that a discussion had taken place on the possibility of securing the means of prosecuting for perjury, in case that should unfortunately be necessary. It was then decided, that their Lordships should throw no impediment in the way of any such prosecutions. Still, as there were considerable doubts respecting this decision, he would ask the Noble and Learned Lord if he remained of the same opinion on the subject.

The Lord Chancellor said this was the most extraordinary question he ever heard; and he should therefore decline answering it. It was not becoming to anticipate prosecutions for perjury. He would ask the Noble Lord, whether it was not, in a moral point of view, substantially punishing for perjury, to hold out such a probability with respect to past evidence, which, for any thing he knew, might be confirmed by witnesses yet to be called.

Earl Grosvenor observed, that the Learned Lord had charged him with improper anticipations; but their Lordships would recollect, that the subject had been already under consideration. The Learned Lord himself had previously given his opinion. He (Lord Grosvenor) merely proposed to give effect to their Lordships' understood intention, by passing a short bill declaring that their Lordships would not impede any prosecution for perjury.

The conversation dropped without any decision.

THE QUEEN'S DEFENCE.

Cross-examination of Fifteenth Witness continued.

Lieut. John Flynn was called in, and his cross-examination very sharply continued by the Solicitor-General. He was first questioned respecting his memorandums, which he said were copies of a sort of private log he kept on board the polacre. Some of the entries in it were made by his clerk, Pasconani. Witness first said he did not know whether this clerk was an Italian or an Englishman; but afterwards he said he was an Italian. On being reminded of the contradiction, he said he did not know which he was, but he believed he was an Italian or Sicilian.—Witness said also at first, that the log was kept in Italian.

Was the part which you wrote in Italian or in English?—The part I wrote was in English.

Did you not tell me that the log was written in Italian?—Yes.

Now you say that part was written in Italian, and part in English?—Part in both, to the best of my recollection.

[The witness here fainted. He was removed from the bar. While he was out, several Peers complained of the oppressive state of the air in the House, and desired that all the windows should be thrown open. The witness returned in a few minutes, and the cross-examination proceeded.]

You, then, as you say, having kept one part of the log, and this Pasconani the other, may I ask which of you kept the greatest part?—I think I did myself; but it is impossible for me now to say, not having my eyes on the book, it not being here before me at the present moment. I may be mistaken, so I cannot say.

But the most of it, you are sure, was kept in English?—There was some English and some Italian.

Then if you said a short time ago, and at first, that the whole of the book was Italian, you said an untruth?

Mr. Denman said he could not suffer his Learned Friend to cast this aspersion on the witness; it was unjust.

The Solicitor-General replied, that, as the question was objected to, he should not press it in that form; he would, therefore, withdraw the former question, and put this instead of it:—

Did you not say a part of the book was written in English?—I told you so, perhaps; but what I said at the moment was when I was so circumstanced by indisposition that I knew not exactly what I said.

Then do you mean now to say that part of the book was written in the Italian language, and part in the English? is that what you mean to say?—Yes, it is.

Which is the greatest part then, in the English or the Italian?—I cannot say with very much accuracy.

Was there, however, a considerable part of it in English?—I really cannot say; I think there was.

How much?—I think as much in one as in the other.

Do you mean to say that the greater part was written in English?—About the same in one, I think, as in the other.

Did you not tell us yesterday that the paper was in your own hand-writing?—I do not remember, but I did not recollect at the moment.

Was not the paper in your hand at the time?—It might have been in my hand at the moment; but I do not recollect that I referred to it at the moment.

Now, however, you say no part of it is in your own hand-writing?—No.

In whose hand-writing is it?—Schiavini's.

Re-examined by Mr. Denman.—You say that this paper was written by Schiavini?—Yes.

When did he write it?—A few days ago.

From what did he write it?—From the paper which I had in my hand-writing and Pasconani's. It was written from my dictation.

The Solicitor-General begged that, before the witness was ordered to withdraw, he should be ordered to deposit the paper he had with the clerk of the house.

Mr. Denman objected to this application, and said that he was entitled to see the paper before any thing was done with it: he had no copy of it, nor did he ever see it until now.

The Attorney-General said the paper ought to be deposited, whether his Learned Friend saw it or not.

Mr. Denman hoped no insinuation was intended that he had seen this paper before this day at the bar. If such were attempted, he must repel it in the manner it deserved.

Cries of "Order" from the House.

Mr. Brougham hoped that, if their Lordships suffered these insinuations to be flung out at one side, they would in justice allow them to be repelled on the other.

The Earl of Lauderdale said that Counsel must abide by the decision of the House, and not provoke unnecessary remarks.

Earl Grey said that it was the duty of their Lordships to abstain from replying to any extraneous remarks made by Counsel at either side; but when Counsel appeared to them to exceed their line of duty, to interpose and stop the extraneous remarks, but not to do so by cries of "Order." *(Hear.)*

Examined by Lord Kingston.—Witness, as he was walking the quarter-deck, occasionally looked into the tent. Her Royal Highness sometimes called to him in the night, when any noise occurred, and witness answered. When the wind was high, and the Princess could not hear, he used to lift up the tent and look in.

By the Earl of Donoughmore.—Witness has been 11 years in active service in the Navy. He has been entrusted with a secret mission to the Island of Corsica, to make inquiries respecting Murat. He received 600 dollars from the Princess for three years service. He knew where Bergami slept on going out from Messina, but not in returning home to Sicily.

You have stated over and over again, that you do not know where Bergami slept in the voyage home: how, then, are you so perfect in forming the negative idea as to where he did not sleep? As you cannot say where he slept, how can you be so confident that he did not sleep under the tent?—

Mr. Brougham.—Really, my Lords, I cannot admit this question to be put. The Noble Lord has assumed that the witness stated he knew where this individual slept; whereas, on the contrary, he has declared, over and over again, that he could not say where this person slept.

Here there was a cry of "Let the witness withdraw."

The Duke of Clarence.—I think the Counsel ought also to withdraw.

The Counsel and the witness having withdrawn,

The Duke of Clarence said he rose to order. It had been said by a Noble Earl that day, that when any thing irregular or improper occurred at the bar, no Noble Lord should cry "Order," but state what passed, and offer his objection to it. He would pursue this course. He conceived that the conduct of the Learned Counsel, a few minutes before, was not what it ought to be. He thought that the Learned Counsel had commenced an objection in a manner not suitable to the dignity of the House. He had stated, that "*he could not permit* a question to be put in a particular way." This is all I have to say. I do not wish to interrupt my Noble Friend, but I did not think the objection stated in a way suitable to the dignity of your Lordships.

Lord Foley (as was understood) was of opinion that a fair latitude ought to be given to the Counsel in offering their objections.

The Duke of Clarence.—I do not mean to say, and God forbid that I should, that we, who are not professional or learned Lords, should not be stopped by Counsel, if improper questions are demanded. But I think it is the duty of this House to see that Counsel, when they address your Lordships, state, in a proper and respectful manner, whether a question in their opinion should or should not be put.

Lord Redesdale concurred in the opinion that objections ought to be put in the most respectful manner.

The Earl of Albemarle observed that the Counsel was stopped in the midst of his reasoning on the question, which he did not consider a just course of proceeding.

The Lord Chancellor said it was nothing more than reasonable that they should allow Counsel to interrupt any of their Lordships, if he conceived that an improper question was asked of a witness. At the same time, he was sure that, in addressing their Lordships, a different language should have been used.

Mr. Brougham, on his return, explained that nothing disrespectful was meant by his mode of objecting to the question, but that he merely used that mode as the shortest.

The question was not allowed: but Lord Donoughmore continued to examine.

You have mentioned that you have gone into the tent at night, by the orders of her Royal Highness?—I never went into the tent.

To the door?—There was no door; there was an opening.

You have lifted up a part of the tent so as to see her Royal Highness?—I have looked in.

Well, looked in, so as to see her Royal Highness?—Yes, I have, my Lord.

How was she on those occasions? was she dressed?—She was dressed, my Lord.

She was dressed?—Yes, my Lord, lying on her bed.

By Lord Colville.—The tent was about 22 feet long, and it occupied the whole breadth of the ship, except about a foot.

By the Duke of Clarence.—Witness had been to sea about 19 years, eight as a Midshipman, and eleven as a Lieutenant.—The Noble Duke examined the witness at very great length respecting the *binnacle* (the place where the light is kept), and betrayed considerable ignorance of nautical affairs, though he used a great many technical terms. His Royal Highness laboured for a long time to make the witness confess a neglect of duty in not having amended the awkward binnacle on board the polacre. The witness said he did not take notice of it when he first went on board, being occupied with other arrangements for her Royal Highness; and that when at sea, it was too late. The Duke asked why this and that could not have been done to it; and the witness as often satisfactorily explained why. At length the Illustrious Duke ceased; and the witness shortly afterwards withdrew.

[This witness, in the course of the day, was asked an extraordinary number of questions respecting the extent of his command on board the polacre. He explained, clearly enough to any decent comprehension, that he commanded it by order of the Princess, and that the master Gargiulo took general orders from him, and repeated them to the sailors. But this would not do for certain Lords and the Counsel for the Bill, who strove hard to confound the witness by asking whether his command did not clash with that of the master?—whether he never gave orders to the men himself? and fifty other useless impertinences.]

WILLIAM CARRINGTON.

Lord Melville had intimated to the House this morning, that he could extract some important particulars from William Carrington. That person was now called in, and asked, whether he had not said that he had never been in any ship before he was on board the Poictiers; he replied he understood that the question referred entirely to his being with Sir John Beresford; and that he certainly had been on board other ships.

W. Carrington, in answer to other questions, also gave the following account of his leaving the navy:—Sir W. Gell was once a passenger in the Poictiers, and there received some attentions from witness, who was then a midshipman; in return for which he proffered witness his good offices with Sir J. Beresford. Witness stated to Sir William, that he expected a Lieutenant's warrant, but that as he had not means to appear as a gentleman on the quarter-deck, he wished to leave the navy. After various remonstrances against this resolution, Sir J. Beresford procured his discharge, and witness went into the service of Sir W. Gell.—Witness farther stated, that he had always been strongly recommended by all his commanding officers.

[In consequence of Dr. Lushington having accidentally missed a page in his brief while examining this witness before, he was allowed to ask some further questions; and the important fact was elicited (in contradiction of Demont) that witness had made William Austin's bed out of the Princess's room several times before they arrived at Naples.]

Sixteenth Witness.

Joseph Robert Hownam was examined by Mr. Tindall. He stated, that he had been a Lieutenant in the navy since the beginning of 1809. He joined the party of the Princess of Wales at Genoa in April 1815. He never knew that Bergami breakfasted with the Princess at Genoa. Witness dined with her Royal Highness every day at Genoa, and Bergami never dined with them. Bergami began to dine with the Princess on a journey over Mont St. Gothard, in August 1815; but he did not dine regularly with her till some time after at Villa d'Este. At Tunis, the bed-rooms of Bergami and the Princess were three or four rooms apart. On board the polacre, the master had no duty to perform that could carry him to that part of the vessel occupied by her Royal Highness and suite, which was quite distinct from his own and the crew's part. The party on the Eastern journey slept on the plains of Ephesus, under an open shed constructed of planks and boughs. The suite slept all around the Princess. They dined the next day all together in the church-yard. On the voyage from Jaffa homewards a tent was erected on the deck of the polacre, by the desire of the Princess, on account of the excessive heat, and the smell of the animals below.—Adjourned.

Wednesday, Oct. 11.

Examination of Sixteenth Witness continued.

Lieut. Joseph Robert Hownam was called in, and his examination continued by Mr. Tindall. He stated, that he had sometimes gone up the ladder which led from below into the tent, at ten o'clock at night, to go on deck; but finding the tent closed, he had gone down again. He had heard that two persons reposed in the tent, but he did not know. On the journey by land from St. Jean d'Acre to Jerusalem, he believed that the Princess reposed without undressing, because he never saw any bed-clothes on the sofa she used. He never saw any bed-clothes either in the tent on board the polacre. He remembered the occasion on which the sea broke into the tent, and compelled her Royal Highness to go below: he was called up immediately, and when going up to the deck, he met her Royal Highness coming down, dressed, and handed, he believed by Bergami (dressed) and Capt. Flynn. The Princess used a bathing-tub, which witness did not think it possible to put in the cabin.

During the time you were on board, have you ever seen her Royal Highness sitting on a gun with Bergami?—Never.

Did you ever see them sitting on a bench, with his arm round her Royal Highness, or her arm round him?—Never.

Did you ever see the one kiss the other?—Never.

Did you ever see any impropriety or indecency of conduct on the part of the one towards the other?—Never.

There was a person named Mahomet on board on the return from Jaffa, who performed a dance, which originated in a quarrel between him and the Doctor. The latter wished to give him physic, which Mahomet refused to take, and used to laugh at the Doctor and dance before him.

Did you ever observe any thing improper or indecent in that dance?—Nothing in the least indecent, any more than in the Spanish *Bolero*, or the Negro-dance.

At Terracina witness believed that Bergami, Cameron, and Theodore Majocchi landed. On their leaving the ship, all were on deck.

In what manner did they take leave of her Royal Highness?—They kissed her Royal Highness's hand, as they used to do, in a respectful manner.

Now I put to you whether Bergami did or did not kiss her Royal Highness on that occasion?—What! her face?

Yes, her face?—No; he certainly did not.

The Villa Barona was a small house given by the Princess to Bergami. No large fete could be given there. There were only small entertainments, in Carnival time, for the amusement of the farmers' families, and the Princess's household. The persons who attended the entertainment used to bring their wives and daughters. Witness has seen there the wife and daughter of the Prefect of Como, the wives of Baron ———, and Professor Mochetti. The Clergyman used to visit her Royal Highness.

Can you say whether her Royal Highness was constantly in the dancing-room during the entertainments?—She was not constantly. She remained in an adjoining room, and came in occasionally.

Did you partake in these dances?—Always.

Did her Royal Highness retire before the dancing was finished?—Yes.

When you were present, did you ever see any thing indecent or indecorous in the conduct of the persons present?—I never did.

At Trieste, the Princess was received by all persons of distinction. Her Royal Highness passed but one night at Trieste, and that night she went to the Opera. Witness recollected that circumstance distinctly because on that night he wrote a letter to a lady he has since married. The Princess frequently visited her servants when they were sick.

How was her Royal Highness received at the different courts where she appeared during the course of her travels?—In the usual way, and according to her rank.

What was her own demeanour?—Filled with majesty and grace.

How was she ordinarily received?—With all due and proper attendance.

Witness recollected the journey from Rome to Sinigaglia. He believed Carlo Forti acted as courier then. Sacchi was taken ill

during the journey, having received a hurt as he left the post-office.

How long have you been, on the whole, in the society of her Royal Highness?—I was first introduced to her Royal Highness in the month of April of the year 1815, and I continued in her society till the year 1818.

During that period did you observe any thing improper, indecent, or degrading to her station, in the conduct of her Royal Highness?—No.

Not towards Bergami?—No, never.

Witness's salary from the Princess was 200*l.* a year; and that is now continued.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—On the journey to Mount St. Gothard in August, Bergami, though in a courier's dress, rode in a carriage—witness thinks with Hieronymus, who had also a courier's dress. Witness believed it was at Bellinzona that Bergami dined with the Princess. He was then dressed as a courier. Witness and Professor Mochetti dined with her Royal Highness on the same occasion. About September, Bergami began to dine regularly with the Princess, and did not afterwards appear in his courier's dress. On the tour to Mount St. Gothard there were no English gentlemen besides witness with her Royal Highness. At the Villa d'Este, witness had frequently seen the Princess and Bergami walking together, arm-in-arm, before they set out on the long voyage,—as he has seen her Royal Highness walk with other gentlemen. Witness has also seen them on the lake in a small boat alone.

You have seen her Royal Highness dining with Bergami, when he was a courier, in his courier's dress; you afterwards saw her walking with him at the Villa d'Este, arm in arm; you also saw them go out alone, in a boat, together; and you have stated that Bergami, after a certain time, dined regularly with her Royal Highness: do you think this conduct was, or was not, degrading to her Royal Highness's situation?—I never saw her Royal Highness walk arm in arm with Bergami till he began to dine regularly with her.

You must perceive that is no answer to my question. I beg to put it again, whether you consider that which you have stated as degrading to her Royal Highness or not?—I do not.

Now, Sir, you have stated that you don't recollect seeing her Royal Highness walk arm in arm with Bergami before he dined regularly with her. I ask you, on your oath, whether you did not see them walk arm in arm during the journey to Mount St. Gothard?—I do not recollect.

You do not recollect?—I swear I do not recollect it.

Do you swear they did not?—I think, to the best of my recollection, that I did not see them.

You have said that you did not consider the conduct you have described as at all degrading to her Royal Highness; have you never represented to her Royal Highness that it was degrading for Bergami to dine with her?—I never did.

Did you never desire her Royal Highness not to admit Bergami to her table?—Not to my recollection, I did not.

Nor any thing to that effect?—Nor any thing to that effect.

Then you never entreated her Royal Highness not to admit Bergami to her table?—I never did.

Then, if you never did entreat her Royal Highness not to admit Bergami to her table, you could never have represented to any person that you had done so?—I don't think I ever could.

I don't ask whether you could or not, but whether you did or not, state that you entreated her Royal Highness not to admit Bergami to her table?—I am confident I did not.

You are positive you never did?—I am positive I never did. I feel convinced I never did.

Have you never stated "that you entreated her Royal Highness, on your knees, with tears in your eyes, to dissuade her from admitting Bergami to a seat at her table, without effect?"—Never: I never did such a thing.

I ask you not now whether you ever *did* such a thing; but whether you ever stated to any person that you had so done?—I do not think I ever did. I have no recollection of the fact. I never did so.

If the fact never happened, you can have no doubt you never did it?—I can have no doubt.

[This point was pressed upon witness again more than once, and he answered in the same strait-forward manner.]

After Mr. W. Burrell left, when you were at the Villa d'Este, was not her Royal Highness in the habit of amusing herself in the evening with the servants?—Frequently.

Did her Royal Highness join in those games or amusements?—Yes, I have seen her play at the game of *colin-maillard* (blind man's buff).

Were there not several games at which they played?—Yes, there were many *petit jeux*.

I ask you were those games played before Mr. W. Burrell left her Royal Highness?—I do not recollect.

Have you any doubt that they were not?—I rather think they were played when he was there; but I am not sure.

Witness has seen the Princess perform in a theatre at Villa d'Este; but he did not recollect seeing her perform the part of Columbine. There were more than two hundred persons present. Witness has seen Lewis Bergami perform the part of Harlequin.

Do you remember any part performed by her Royal Highness that evening?—I think she performed the part of an automaton. (*Laughter.*)

What do you mean when you say that you think her Royal Highness performed the part of an automaton?—It is so long since that I do not recollect the history of it. It was something respecting a man who wished to sell an automaton; which was a woman, in fact, that could wind up any thing. (*General laughter.*)

Did Bergami perform the part of the person who wanted to sell the automaton?—No; I think it was the Chevalier Tomasia (Prefect of Como.)

And who was the purchaser?—The Professor Mochetti.

Did Bergami perform any part at all?—I think not.

Witness recollected the fete at the Villa d'Este. He did not know whether it was St. Bartholomew's Day. He did not think the fete was given in honour of Bergami: he thought it was given in honour of the Princess's taking possession of the Villa. On the return from Jaffa, witness did not know where Bergami slept on board the polacre. He had heard and believed that he slept under the tent.

And, believing that, I ask you whether you think that was degrading or not to her Majesty?—No, I think it was necessary that some one should sleep near her Royal Highness on that occasion. I heard that other people slept there too.

I don't ask you about that, but about your belief whether Bergami's sleeping there was, in your judgment, degrading to her Royal Highness's station?—No, I never thought it was.

On your arrival at Syracuse do you recollect a fete on board the polacre on St. Bartholomew's-day?—I recollect the sailors had a fete on board, and danced.

Who regaled them?—I don't know.

Who do you believe it was?—I suppose it was Bergami.

Why do you believe Bergami did?—Because, in those countries, they always keep the day of their name as a birth-day.

Was this day kept in honour of Bergami?—There were rejoicings on board, and every one keeps that day in Italy.

Witness did not remember whether, in walking the deck of the polacre in the port of Syracuse, the Princess took Bergami's arm or not.

I ask whether it was so usual a thing for Bergami to walk arm in arm with her Royal Highness, that, if done at Syracuse, it would have made no impression on your mind?—It would not.

In travelling to Jerusalem, they reposed under tents. Witness had seen her Royal Highness, on alighting from her ass, throw herself on a sofa. He did not know whether Bergami slept in the same tent.

What is your belief?—I dare say he might; but I do not know.

In the journey from Rome to Sinigaglia, witness rather thought the Countess Oldi and Bergami travelled with her Royal Highness. The little Victorine certainly did, as he recollected from the circumstance of her having refused to travel in witness's carriage, because he had been upset in it near Insprück. Bergami's mother Madame Livia, and Louis Bergami, used to dine at the table of the Princess at Pesaro, after the long voyage.

[The witness underwent the very long cross-examination of the Attorney-General in a most exemplary manner, never being once betrayed into the slightest inconsistency.]

Re-examined.—You have said, that at the Villa d'Este her Royal Highness joined in certain games, which you described. Were the whole of her household, or only the upper servants, allowed to join in those amusements?—Only the upper servants; the footmen never did.

You have stated that you believed Bergami to have slept under the tent: what was your reason for believing so?—During the squalls which occurred whilst we were off the coast of Caramania, and which made her Royal Highness go below, Bergami told me that the sea came into the tent; now, he must have been in the tent to have known it.

You have stated that you have seen the Princess walking arm in arm with Bergami; have you ever seen her walking in the same manner with others of her household?—Yes, she has walked so with me; I have seen her walking so with Schiavini, and with other gentlemen who have come to visit her at the Villa d'Este, and so forth.

By Earl Roseberry.—Do you believe that during the voyage, any other persons slept in the tent at the time of the Princess and Bergami's sleeping there, I mean?—I am not certain. The

Countess Oldi told me so. (Cries of "No, no.") I do not know it, from only having heard it.

By Earl Grey.—Under the circumstances under which you believe Bergami to have slept under the tent, did it convey to your mind any suspicion of improper connexion between him and the Princess?—No, it did not.

By the Earl of Limerick.—Would it not have sufficiently answered the purpose if a female had been placed in the tent instead of a male, or besides a male person, the tent being fully equal to contain three persons?—I cannot answer the question; there might have been 50 other ways of doing it, and we might have all slept outside round the tent as well as one.

Then you do not conceive there is any impropriety in a male person sleeping in the same tent with a female, the light being out?—From the manner, the hatches being open, and all the doors below, I do not. There was no mystery in it whatever.

I beg to ask you whether you would like your wife—(No, no, and some laughter)—would you have any objection, or conceive it improper that Mrs. Hownam should so sleep in a tent with a male person?—Every man, I trust, looks at his wife without making any comparison or exception. I never made any comparison.

Then you cannot form any opinion upon it?—I cannot.

I beg to know whether you see any impropriety, situated as the tent was, with the hatches open, in a male and female so sleeping?—I do not conceive that there was any impropriety, because if there had been, I must have felt it. I have seen the Princess in so many situations during her travels, that I do not look upon it as improper.

What do you mean by saying that you have seen the Princess in so many situations during her travels?—I have seen her under a sorry shed at Ephesus, under which we should hardly put a cow in this country, in the midst of horses, mules, and Turks. It did not strike me as improper.—Adjourned.

Thursday, Oct. 12.

EXAMINATION OF LIEUT. HOWNAM CONTINUED.

By the Earl of Darnley.—What was your opinion of Bergami as a servant to her Royal Highness?—I must confess that Bergami was excessively attentive to her Royal Highness, and most ready in his duty.

Was he, on account of his activity and vigilance, more likely to be selected by her Royal Highness from among her servants than any other?—I think he was. I should think that from the way in which I have seen the Marquis of ——— behave to him, and his recommendation, he was the most likely one, and the man whose behaviour as shown by the Marquis would most justify the selection.

Was no suspicion of impropriety of conduct on the part of her Royal Highness entertained in your mind?—None.

A question was put yesterday respecting your wife: may I ask you what is the age of Mrs. Hownam?—About 30.

Have you always lived together as man and wife ought to do?—

On this question being put there was a loud cry of "Order! order!" and considerable confusion, amidst which the witness (as was understood) answered—"We have."

The Earl of LAUDERDALE.—I will just ask your Lordships how this can be evidence?

The LORD CHANCELLOR could not conceive how the question could apply in any way to the inquiry before their Lordships.

You are well acquainted with Lieut. Flynn?—Yes.

You believe him to be a man of honour and veracity?—I believe Lieut. Flynn to be perfectly a man of honour.

By Earl Grosvenor.—If her Royal Highness had been so outrageously indecent as to suffer herself to be kissing Bergami in the presence of the master and mate, I ask you whether it would not have been the cause of conversation among all on board?—

(Several Lords cried "*No, no.*")

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—If one witness swear to a fact, you may call 20 witnesses to give their opinion that it was not true.

Earl GROSVENOR.—I only ask the witness whether such a thing could have occurred without coming to his knowledge.—[The question was not put.]

By the Earl of Lauderdale.—Have you read the evidence printed in the daily newspapers?—I have not even read my own evidence given yesterday.

Have you read the evidence of Sacchi?—Part of it I have read, and part I have not.

Was any part of Sacchi's evidence pointed out to you?—Not that I recollect.

How did you then select the passages you read of Sacchi's evidence?—I did not select any passages; I have read it as any person would have done. I don't at this moment recollect any part I read of it.

You have read the whole of it then?—No.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—My Lords, I object to questions assuming the very reverse of what the witness has answered.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE gave some explanation, which we were unable to hear, but which the Duke of Clarence and a Noble Lord on his left cheered!!

The Marquis of LANSDOWN.—I object to the word "select" being entered as part of a question to the witness, for he had not said that he had selected the passages he read.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE rose to explain, when the witness was ordered to withdraw. The witness said he had partially read Sacchi's evidence, but not all. What is the inference but that there was part he had read, and part he had not? Now how could this happen if part had not been pointed out to him for reading?

The Marquis of LANSDOWN.—I have read a paper partially this morning, and yet I have selected no part of it. (*Hear, hear, hear.*)

Earl GREY.—A person very naturally reads one passage, and then passes over the rest of the same subject. Is that selection?

The Earl of LAUDERDALE.—Call in the witness!!

I ask you, recollecting that you dined at her Royal Highness's table with Bergami, whom you had seen waiting at table, and with Bergami's brother, sister, and mother; and recollecting further that Bergami slept under the tent between Jaffa and Capo d'Anse, whether you persevere in thinking that there was nothing improper in her Royal Highness's conduct?—I speak for myself. I have no greater claim than either of those mentioned to sit at the table of her Royal Highness; I have seen sons sit at table while the father waited; and I never saw any thing that I thought improper, considering the manner, the kindness, and condescension of her Royal Highness towards all her servants. (There was a general movement among their Lordships on hearing this answer read by Mr. Gurney.)

Did you ever wait at table?—I did not.

Did your mother dine with her Royal Highness?—No.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—A Lieutenant in his Majesty's navy is asked if he ever waited at table!

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Mr. Brougham, object to the question if you think it improper, but you are not to make such observations if a question offends you.

I wish the witness now to say whether he continues to think a courier and a Lieutenant in his Majesty's navy equally entitled to sit at her Royal Highness's table?—I think any person sitting at table by her Royal Highness's command would have authorized one in a higher rank than a Lieutenant in the navy to sit at the same table.

By Lord Duncannon.—Did not the swell of the sea, occasionally, make female attendance upon her Royal Highness absolutely impossible?—When there was any sea, all the female attendants and the Countess were as ill as her Royal Highness herself, and consequently could not well attend her.

Am I to understand, then, that male attendants were absolutely and indispensably necessary, both by day and by night?—I should think that, for any thing which her Royal Highness might want, there should be a male attendant to procure it for her.

[The majority of the questions put to Lieutenant Hownam—whose examination by the Peers this morning lasted more than four hours and a half—were of a description perfectly extraordinary. They chiefly related to points already explained by witness, and in many instances, the Noble Lords assumed that he had said what he had not, thus compelling the witness to tax his memory on all sorts of petty irrelevant points, and giving rise to all sorts of squabbles among the judges and counsel. The multitude of questions too which were asked to extract the witness's opinion respecting the propriety or delicacy of the conduct of the Princess, was equally astonishing. "When an old gentleman," says the *Traveller*, "with a brown caxon and a voice like a cracked trumpet, or anything else more brazen and discordant, asks—"Do you mean to say you saw her Royal Highness's legs swelled?" we should naturally say this is not the way to support decency."]

SEVENTEENTH WITNESS.

Granville Sharp, Esq., of the East India Company's Military Service, was called, and proved, that the Moorish dance is very common in India, and is exhibited before the most decent companies. The Bishop of Calcutta, as well as the Governor-General, and their Ladies, were among those who had witnessed this spectacle.

Cross-examined.—There were many kinds of the Moorish dance, but this was the ordinary one. Witness never heard of any at which ladies did not think it proper to be present.

EIGHTEENTH WITNESS.

Santino Gussiare was examined. He stated, that he was the Princess of Wales's factor at the Villa d'Este, that is, overseer

and director of the workmen. He remembered the grotto at the Villa d'Este, and the statues of Adam and Eve in one of the rooms. There were two other rooms in the grotto in which a cornice was made; but it was not possible to see the statues from them, because the passage from them to the room of the statues was crooked. [The witness drew a plan upon paper, from which it most clearly appeared, that it was quite impossible to see the statues from the rooms in which the cornice was made.] The work in the grotto was done, and the scaffolding taken away, eight or ten days before the Princess returned from the long voyage.

NINETEENTH WITNESS.

Guiseppe Garolini, master mason, completely confirmed the last witness in his statement respecting the grotto.—Adjourned.

Friday, Oct. 13.

MILAN COMMISSION—SUBORNATION OF PERJURY.

Guiseppe Carolini was further examined. He stated, that at the time his balance against her Royal Highness was 45,000 francs, Rastelli (courier, and witness for the Bill) came to him, and spoke about a way of getting it paid.

[Here the Solicitor-General objected to the conversation of witness with a third person, but it was allowed for the purpose of contradicting Rastelli, who had sworn that he was not an agent of the Milan Commission in getting witnesses.]

Did Rastelli say what you were to do for getting the bill paid?—He told me that if I had any thing to say against her Royal Highness, for I had been long in her service, to tell him, and he would endeavour to make me be paid.

Had you any further conversation with Rastelli?

The Solicitor-General again objected; on which Mr. Williams very powerfully urged the absolute necessity (if justice was to govern the proceedings) of his being allowed to show that the witnesses for the Bill acted under influence.—A debate ensued on the point of law, in the course of which the Earl of Carnarvon expressed himself with great warmth. He declared that they ought not to proceed one step further in *this odious, detested, and infamous proceeding (Hear!)* without enquiring into this strong appearance of subornation. The further they proceeded, added the Noble Lord, the more they would be entangled; and nothing was now to be done but to abolish the Bill altogether. The examination was allowed to proceed.

Mr. Williams then proceeded to question the witness, who deposed, that he had various conversations with Rastelli, in which that person stated the progress he was making in his agency, the names and number of the recruits he had raised, and the bounties he had paid, over and above their expenses on the road, to induce them to go to Milan. Forty and fifty francs were the sums generally paid.

Nothing particular was elicited on cross-examination. In the examination by the Peers, the Earl of Lauderdale asked a question respecting the bath-room at Villa d'Este, which was immediately objected to by Mr. Brougham as opening quite a new case.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE contended that it was competent for any Peer to call any witness during any part of the prosecution, and ask him any question he pleased respecting the conduct of her Majesty, and any or every part of that conduct. *(Hear.)*

The Earl of DARNLEY remarked, that he was interrupted yesterday, and by the very Noble Earl who spoke last, in a material part of a course of examination, which he thought, if he had pursued it further, would operate rather favourably for the interest of one of the parties in this case—the accused. Keeping in mind this understanding, he could not refrain from taking this opportunity of remarking, that, notwithstanding what had been said by some of their Lordships of dignity and decency, of which he had heard so much, there were some to be found who appeared—instead of being impartial judges, and disposed to lean to the side of mercy—to have feelings of an opposite character.

Here cries of "*Order*" interrupted the Noble Lord; and a conversation followed respecting his imputations, in which Lord Lauderdale protested that he had enjoyed all his life a feeling that he acted rightly and never more so than now!—The witness soon after withdrew.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—I wish to know of my Learned Friend whether we can have access to Rastelli. Is he here? Is he in this country?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL stretched across the bar, and gave an answer to Mr. Brougham in a very low tone of voice.

A short pause ensued, owing to the Lord Chancellor's leaving the House. Immediately after his return,

Mr. BROUGHAM said, My Lords, I wish Rastelli to be called.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—If my Learned Friend wishes to call Rastelli, he certainly can call him.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—I wish to know if Rastelli is in the country, and, if in the country, where he is?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, that whether Rastelli was in the country or was not, his Learned Friend must take the ordinary means to procure his attendance.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—Mr. Attorney, is Rastelli here?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—No! he is sent to Milan.

Mr. BROUGHAM.—I wish to know, my Lords, whether, under these circumstances, after it is made known to your Lordships that this individual, whose conduct has been so strongly implicated, has been sent out to Milan—I say, my Lords, I wish to know whether I am to be obliged to go on with this Bill?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that Rastelli had been sent to Milan with dispatches, under the idea that he would not be again wanted.

Mr. BROUGHAM said, if there was any thing which the prosecutors ought not to have done, it was to send Rastelli out as the agent of this ——— Milan Commission. *(Hear, hear!)*

Counsel were ordered to withdraw, and

Lord HOLLAND rose to state, in behalf of their Lordships and the cause of justice, that the fact which had just come out at their Lordships' bar, that subornation had been practised to a considerable extent, was absolutely monstrous. *(Loud cries of hear, hear! from both sides for many moments.)* At the commencement of this unfortunate business, the Noble Earl over the way assured their Lordships, with great earnestness, that he would do every thing in his power to secure full justice to the accused, and to protect their Lordships from fraud and perjury. What now appeared to be the case? Why, it appeared that out of those men who had been dragged to the Bar of the House, and some of whom had probably been bribed—*(Loud cries of hear, hear)*—it appeared that that very man who had given the most revolting and disgusting testimony, not only had withdrawn, but had been actually sent out of the country as soon as notice had been given that his testimony was to be impeached,—*(Cheers.)*—Gracious God! (exclaimed the Noble Lord), can your Lordships—I ask it in the name of common sense and common feeling—can your Lordships suppose that, after such a proceeding as this, great as is the reputation of your Lordships, great as is the character of this House, which I have always been eager to uphold by every means in my power—can you suppose that we, who are subject to human failings and human infirmities, can stand in safety when opposed to the suspicion and the odium which such a proceeding must cast upon us?—*(Loud cheers.)*—What is the case, my Lords? Here is Rastelli, upon whom suspicion now rests that he has been engaged in suborning witnesses for this prosecution, not merely escaping, but sent away by the Government! *(Hear, hear!)* If your Lordships submit to be dragged through the mire in this manner—if, after having solemn promises made to you, you permit them not only to be evaded, but even to be counteracted by those who made them, then are your proceedings a mockery and a burlesque. He therefore said, with his Noble Friend (Lord Carnarvon) who had made such a solemn appeal to them that morning, that this matter ought to be set right, or that, considering all these circumstances as forming a *prima facie* case of the existence of a conspiracy to pervert justice, they would do well to get rid of the disgust and fatigue of this infamous proceeding. *(Hear, hear!)*

The Earl of LIVERPOOL could assure the Noble Lord that he was totally ignorant of Rastelli having been sent abroad. It was a most ill-judged measure, but it was totally without the knowledge of Ministers, or of the Attorney-General. The Noble Lord concluded by saying, that every allowance ought to be made in the case of her Majesty, in consequence of this circumstance.

The LORD CHANCELLOR admitted that it was a most ill-judged and ill-timed proceeding. The injury to the Queen could not be repaired *(hear!)*; but her Majesty must have every liberal allowance on account of the error.

The Earl of CARNARVON, after observing that the Lord Chancellor had in fact admitted that substantial justice could not be done to the Queen, said, the only remedy left for them was to put an end to the Bill at once, which had long enough already disgusted all public feeling, outraged all common sense, and disgraced the country. He moved, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—I never would enter this House again, with quiet to my mind, if I admitted, as the Noble Earl asserts, that this House could not do substantial justice. Allowing liberally and largely for the circumstance that has happened, it may turn out to be extremely favourable to her Majesty.

Earl GREY strongly reprobated the withdrawing the witness at the present moment, as not only ill-judged, but most iniquitous, and did not see in what way substantial justice could now be done, since all the advantage would be lost of examining Rastelli at the moment when he was contradicted.

At length, after further debate, *George Allen Powell*, the Milan Commissioner, was put to the bar, and examined by Earl Grey.

He stated, that Rastelli had been employed to bring over the witnesses that were maltreated at Dover; that various reports had reached Italy of this maltreatment, which filled the families of these individuals with uneasiness, and that he had therefore sent Rastelli to them, thinking it would afford considerable relief, if some person who had been an eye-witness to the treatment they received, and who was acquainted with the families, should be sent over;—and that Rastelli had promised to be back by the 3d of the present month; but that he (witness) had heard, in answer to his letters to Italy, that Rastelli was ill, having been blooded for a fever.—Lord Erskine proposed, that before proceeding farther, her Majesty's Counsel should be asked whether the withdrawing of this witness could materially affect her Majesty's cause. This question, from the lateness of the hour, was adjourned.

Saturday, Oct. 4.

ADJOURNED DEBATE, &c.

Lord Carnarvon withdrew his motion, and asked Lord Liverpool, as that Noble Earl had said "every thing had been done to further the ends of justice," *what* instructions he had given respecting the detention of the witnesses in this country.

Lord LIVERPOOL said he had given *no* special instructions, as the wish of the House was perfectly understood.

In order to explain how Rastelli came to get a passport at the Foreign-office, Mr. Planta, on the motion of Lord Carnarvon, was sent for.

In the mean time, Mr. Powell was again called to the bar; and Lord Carnarvon immediately questioned him as to whether any witnesses besides Rastelli had been sent back to Italy?—Mr. Powell stated, that to the best of his knowledge, no witnesses had been sent back, except one who was not present at the Dover affair.

This examination was objected to by Lord Lauderdale, who said that no agent was bound to give evidence against his client.—Lord Grey said, that the object was to ascertain whether other Italians would not have done as well as Rastelli for the mission.—Lord Lauderdale said the question ought to be put in these words—"Whether the witness knows any one of the persons who witnessed the affair at Dover, had been sent back?"—*(No, no.)*

A PEER.—Any other person could have carried the news as well.

The LORD CHANCELLOR maintained with Lord Lauderdale, that the agent ought not to be made to betray the confidence of his client.

Lord HOLLAND begged to ask the Learned Lord whom he regarded as the Principal in this prosecution? It had been said that the House were the prosecutors, and if so, were they not entitled, as *the Principals*, to examine their own agent? *(A laugh.)*

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—"Whatever the popular effect of the question put by the Noble Lord may be, I cannot allow myself to answer a question which the Noble Lord ought not to have put." *(Hear, hear!)*

Further debate ensued; and after Lord Carnarvon had remarked, that his object was to shew how much credit was to be given to Powell's excuse, the question was allowed.

To the best of your knowledge and belief have any persons been sent away equally qualified to carry the intelligence that Rastelli carried?—I have heard that two others have gone.

At the time you resolved to send Rastelli to Milan, had you enquired if any of those witnesses would be soon required?—I made no inquiry on the subject.

Do you consider, as the agent to this commisson, that the witnesses were entirely under your controul?—Certainly not.

Did you make the application to Rastelli to go, or he to you?—I did to him, solely for the purpose of quieting the minds of the families of the witnesses in Cotton-garden.

Did you give instructions to Rastelli to quit Milan and go into the country?—I do not recollect; but he was to take letters from the witnesses in Cotton-garden to their families.

Then it was by means of the letters so conveyed by Rastelli, that witness expected the families in question were to derive the assurance?—By means of his personal appearance and the letter.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH.—Did you send any letter to Colonel Brown upon the subject of Rastelli's mission?—Yes.

Have you got it?—(After some hesitation)—"Yes."

Then you can produce it?—It contains a great deal of private matter, and I do not know that I am warranted in producing it, considering the situation I hold.

Can you produce that part of the letter which refers to Rastelli?—The letter is altogether a *confidential communication*, and I do not think myself at liberty to produce any part of it.

[This answer was given in a very embarrassed manner.]

Earl GREY said he must leave it to the House to enforce this question or not.

I understood you yesterday to have said, that you did not expect Rastelli would be wanted as a witness again in the course of those proceedings, until the case should go down to the Commons; why then did you order him to be back on the 3d of October?—I expected him to return with the papers which I wanted. It was for that purpose, and not from any idea of the necessity of his appearing in this House as a witness. The Counsel for the Queen having stated that Rastelli was wanted no further, it did not suggest itself to me that he would be called again.

Were you not aware that all the witnesses should be produced when required?—Yes, during the progress of the bill.

Were you not present when the First Lord of the Treasury said that they should be ready when required?—Certainly.

Might not the other witnesses have assured the families of those remaining here of their safety?—I considered Rastelli as the best person, as he came with them, and was well acquainted with all their families.

State from your knowledge, as agent in this affair, whether the families of those who were examined here reside at Milan?—I can't state where their families live.

They have all been examined as to their residence?—I don't recollect their residences.

Did Rastelli bring more than one set of witnesses to this country?—I can't recollect their names.

Mention the names of those witnesses who arrived at Dover?—I don't recollect.

Lord DARNLEY.—Witness says he considers that the witnesses were not under his controul; does he know unper whose controul they were?—I can scarcely say under whose controul they are, they may be said to be under the controul of Government generally.

Who is the person authorized by Government to superintend the witnesses?—There are several persons who reside in the same place with the witnesses; but whether they have controul over them I cannot say.

How then did Mr. Powell come to send Rastelli, one of the witnesses, to Milan, if he had no controul over him?

[This question was not answered.]

In point of fact, were persons admitted or refused admission to the place where the witnesses are by your orders?—I have given directions that persons should be admitted, and certainly also that strangers be excluded.

I understood Mr. Powell to say, that Rastelli was not under his controul—by what authority then did Mr. Powell direct Rastelli to leave this country?—As a person concerned in this case.

Did you consult with any of the other agents, or was it solely out of your own head that you sent Rastelli out of the country?—I don't recollect any communication, possibly I might have made it, but I do not recollect.

Mr. Brougham wished the witness to be asked who his employer was?—This question was objected to.

The question was not allowed; and the witness, being further examined, admitted, that other couriers had been sent to the North of Italy.

Mr. Brougham.—Do you know that Rastelli never knew any of the witnesses or their families until he brought them over?—How can I know that?

Do you not know that he swore that he had never seen them before?—No; I do not recollect.

Do you not know that he said of the witnesses—"Some I know, some I do not know: those I know, I only know by coming over with them?"—I do not recollect what Rastelli swore.

Have you not sworn that the reason why you sent Rastelli to Milan was, because he knew all the families of the witnesses?—I beg to observe, that the sending away Rastelli did not refer merely to the families at Milan of the persons whom he brought here.

In answer to some questions by the Attorney-General, witness said the Counsel for the Queen never told him Rastelli would be wanted.

The witness withdrew, and *Mr. Joseph Planta*, Under-Secretary in Lord Castlereagh's office, was examined. He only stated, that upon the application of Mr. Powell, he had granted a passport for Rastelli,—and that there were always passports in the office ready signed by Lord Castlereagh.

Lord Carnarvon moved that, as Rastelli was absent, Counsel be called in, and asked if they were prepared to proceed with any other part of their case?—The Lord Chancellor moved as an Amendment, that Counsel be informed that it remained with them to make any application they thought proper to make to the Court.

Mr. Brougham requested leave to withdraw for a quarter of an hour.

On returning, Mr. Brougham addressed the House as follows:—

My Lords,—In the extraordinary circumstances in which we are placed, and surrounded as we are by a variety of difficulties, we consider it impossible for us to say what future course it may be expedient for us to follow, more than to state that now, to-day, we wish to proceed in the same line of examination as hitherto.

Twentieth Witness.

Filippo Pomi was then examined. He stated, that he saw Rastelli and Demont at the Barona last year making drawings. Rastelli asked witness had he received presents from those persons who had come there? and on witness's answering no, Rastelli made him a present of 40 francs. Rastelli said to witness, on another day, that if witness had any thing to say against the Princess he should get a great present. Witness answered, that he had nothing to say of the Princess but what was good. Rastelli said, "Pomi, if you like, you may make yourself a man;" "adding, you, who have lived in this house day and night, you may have something to depose against the Princess." But witness said, that he had nothing to say against that Lady, who had always done a great deal of good.

The Solicitor-General objected to this evidence because Rastelli had not been examined!

The Lord Chancellor thought the evidence admissible, as it would be hard that the defendant should suffer from the wrong act of the other party.

The witness stated, in continuation, that Rastelli observed to him, that Louisa Demont had made a good day's work of it, and gained a great sum! Witness knew, that Rastelli went about collecting evidence.

Here a legal point was discussed, at the end of which the House adjourned.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTS.

G. Willett, Owen's-row, Islington, picture-frame-maker. Attornies, Messrs. Tottie, Richardson, and Gaunt, Poultry.

R. Euson, Lexden, Essex, brewer. Attorney, Mr. Wright, Gray's-inn-square.

H. Sabine, Fenchurch-street, druggist. Attornies, Messrs. Saxon and Hooper, Pump-court, Temple.

J. Latham, Abingdon, Berkshire, grocer. Attorney, Mr. Osbaldeston, London-street.

M. and R. Gilbert, Tideswell, Derbyshire, linen-drapers. Attornies, Messrs. Hurd and Johnson, Temple.

C. and R. Norris, Bury, Lancashire, cotton-spinners. Attornies, Messrs. Hurd and Johnson, Temple.

G. Houghton, Hercules-buildings, Lambeth, carpenter. Attornies, Messrs. Sabine and Lewis, Carmarthen-street, Tottenham-court-road.

H. Bonser, Belle Sauvage-yard, Ludgate-hill, victualler. Attornies, Messrs. Fisher and Munday, Furnival's-inn.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTCIES SUPERSEDED.

T. Gilson, Nottingham, lacemaker.

W. Larlham, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, coach-master.

BANKRUPTS.

H. Thornton, Rood-lane, upholder.

G. Clarke, St. John's-street, Clerkenwell, shoe-maker.

W. Reynolds, ship Orient, master-mariner.

J. Thomas, and J. Cabell, Oxford-street, linen-drapers.

J. Smith, jun., Ramsgate, carpenter.

T. Bidwith, Bagginswood, Shropshire, farmer.

T. Young, Cheltenham, fishmonger.

G. Hart, Cheltenham, stone-mason.

J. Harris, and C. Cooper, Bristol, wool-and-cloth-factors.

J. Willson, Swanton-Morley, Norfolk, farmer.

PRICE OF STOCKS ON SATURDAY.

3 per Cent. Red. ..... $66\frac{114}{288}$ | 3 per Cent. Cons. ..... $67\frac{113}{288}$.

THE EXAMINER.

London, October 15.

The Austrian Emperor has at length avowed his motives in filling Italy with his soldiers. In an official note, addressed to his brother Allies, he declares his determination *immediately to restore the ancient order of things in Naples.* His reasons are of the usual imperial order:—To suffer the Revolutionists at Naples, he says, is incompatible with the dignity of his Crown; and he feels himself bound to protect the Head of the Christian Church from revolutionary demagogues. "The Austrian troops," says a private account, "continue to pour into Italy from every quarter; several Parks of heavy Artillery have quitted the Arsenal of Vienna for that country. The Landwehr is ordered to be immediately called out; it is supposed, by the middle of this month, that the imperial forces in Italy will amount to upwards of 200,000 strong."

On the whole, we are pleased with this intelligence. If there is one thing more calculated than another to heat the heart's blood and raise the indignant arms of all who call themselves freemen in Italy,—it is the atrocious avowal of this insolent Despot. What! Shall a solemn old stock-fish like this decree away the liberties of millions, because forsooth it does not please him that they should be governed differently from his own slaves? Shall all the world be oppressed and ruined because the Austrians are?—If the spirit of the Italians has not been trampled out of their bodies by long continued despotism, they will read their tyrant and his legions a memorable lesson of humility; and let the blood be on his selfish and insensible head!

The reader must have heard by this time of the singular interruption occasioned to the trial of the Queen. The evidence of *Rastelli*, one of the principal witnesses against her, is being contradicted, and Mr. Brougham calls for him in order to his re-examination, when lo! it appears that the man has been sent off to Italy! *Mr. Powell*, the Ex-Jacobin, and Milan Agent for destroying a woman, is called up to explain; and he says, that out of a tender

care for the families of the Italian witnesses, who had been in great alarm ever since the business at Dover, *he* sent him off to comfort and re-assure them.—A dialogue to the following purport then takes place:—But did you not know that the witnesses were not to be sent out of the country? *Ans.* I told him to be back again by the 3d, and I thought he would not be wanted till the 17th.—Then why did you tell him to be back by the 3d? *Ans.* Because *I* wanted him.—But did you know that the LORD CHANCELLOR and the LORD TREASURER undertook to see that the witnesses should be kept in this country, till the trial was over? *Ans.* No instructions were given me to that effect.—But did you not know it? *Ans.* I was in the House when the LORD TREASURER undertook to do what you say.—Who has the controul and direction of the Cotton Garden establishment? *Ans.* I don't know.—In point of fact, do not you give orders as to who shall and shall not be admitted there? *Ans.* I do. I think it proper, for the safety of the witnesses.

In this spirit the Milan Agent talks, and the Lords absolutely condescend to let him! The *Courier* begins its leading article of yesterday with a most ludicrous affectation on the subject. It says,

"One of the pernicious consequences that might be expected to result from the brutal outrages at Dover, when the Italian witnesses landed there, has actually occurred. We allude to the sending of Rastelli to Milan; a proceeding which, though it cannot be applauded for its discretion, is certainly wholly undeserving," &c.

If the *Courier* says that the measure of a creature of Government "cannot be applauded for its discretion," it amounts to an acknowledgment that it is equally impudent and infamous. The whole secret is obvious enough, and of ancient authority. What king was it?—King HENRY the 2d, we believe,—who found reason to complain that there were always creatures about a ruler to interpret his wishes for him without a language, and go and act accordingly? This man, *Powell*, evidently knew what was felt and wished; and secure of his Bill of Indemnity, and in the teeth of what he heard in the House, sent off his foreign spy to do as well as to escape what he could.

We can do no more this week, than merely refer our readers (which we do, with a weight of feelings upon us struggling for utterance) to the circumstances that have transpired respecting this *Franklin, Fletcher*, or whatever his name may be.

☞ ††

On Sunday last the Earl of Liverpool, Lord Castlereagh, and other Ministers, went to the King, at his cottage in Windsor Park, and they were accompanied by several distinguished Peers of great influence and Borough patronage, to represent to his Majesty the impression which the evidence adduced in opposition to the Bill of Pains and Penalties had made on their minds, so as to make it impossible for them to support it through the House. The Noblemen had an audience of his Majesty, to state their opinion that it ought to be withdrawn. We know not with what complacency this declaration was received; but it is understood that on Monday evening Ministers were disposed to give up the Bill, if the evidence of Lieutenant Flynn should the next day overthrow the testimony of the Master and Mate of the polacca; that of Majocchi and Dumont being considered by them as totally discredited. The contradictions of Lieutenant Flynn, on Tuesday, however, induced them to persevere. Much will, no doubt, depend on the manner in which the sending Rastelli out of the way will be viewed by their Lordships.—*Morning Chronicle.*

SCENES AND SONGS IN THE NEW BEGGAR'S OPERA.

Cotton Garden. A table set out with pipes and tobacco, liquors, and faces between melancholy doubt and merry desperation.

Air—*Fill every glass.*

Solo.—Fill every glass! For wine inspires us
And fires us
With courage to destroy.
Kings that have wives should us employ,
If there's ought else on earth desirous.
Chorus.—Fill every glass, &c.

To them enter Macdeath.

Macdeath. Gentlemen, well met. My heart hath been with you this hour; but an unexpected affair hath detained me.

Majocchi. We were just breaking up to go upon duty. Am I to have the honour of making a *swear* for you, Sir, this evening in the House? I drink a dram now and then with Mrs. Dumont in the way of friendship and intelligence: and I know that about this time, something she has told me respecting the passage on the road, will be worth speaking of.

Macd. I was to have patronized that party—but—

Maj. But what, Sir?

Macd. Is there any man who suspects my courage?

All. We have all been Witnesses of it.

Macd. My honour and truth to the gang?

Maj. I'll be answerable for it.

Macd. In the division of your booty, have I ever shewn the least marks of avarice or injustice?

Sacchi. By *these* questions something seems to have ruffled you. Are any of us suspected?

Macd. I have a fixed confidence, gentlemen, in you all, as men of dishonour; and as such, I value and respect you. But you are all suspected by every one else. Hownam and Rastelli's absence are playing the devil with us.

All. The devil they are!

Maj. What! Is any one about to tell the truth? I'll shoot him through the head, like a dog.

Macd. You had better be quiet.

Sacchi. We had better be off, I think.

Maj. (looking pale and doubtful.) Perhaps we had better go on duty again.

All. No, no. Off, off, off!

Mac. I shall wish myself with you.—*Aside.*)—The devil attend you (*Sits down melancholy at the table.*)

Song and Chorus.—Let us take the boat.
Hark! I hear the sound of coaches,
The hour of a crush approaches;
To your legs, brave boys, and float.
See now all I told!
If we don't make haste, the asses
Will come and steal the passes,
And turn back our brass from gold.

Exeunt singing.

THEATRICAL EXAMINER.

No. 410.

HAYMARKET.

(Omitted last week.)

Rosina. Having tired our head with writing politics, we feel it a refreshment to consider this little moral play, though of small value as a piece of writing except from association of ideas. It was written however by a very agreeable authoress, Mrs. BROOKE, who produced some novels of a superior order. Perhaps she did it, in the same spirit in which we criticise it, for recreation's sake, or to oblige the players with whom she was intimate. And now that we are lazy, and in a mood for guessing, perhaps the subject of it, which is from the beautiful story of *Ruth* in the Bible, was given her by her husband, who was a clergyman. There is THOMSON's imitation of the same story, in his episode of Palamon and Lavinia; but with all our regard for that poet, we must say, that after

the original, we would rather have Mrs. Brooke's unpretending little drama, than his swollen version. Besides, there is Mr. Shield's music to it, as sweet and pastoral as can well be imagined. We could slumber with our wearied brains in the corner of a box, or of a sopha, and be content to hear nothing for half an hour together but the air of *When the rosy morn appearing*. It is every thing that is young, gentle, chearful, and innocent.

The transition from *Ruth* to Mr. Connor is somewhat violent; but the drama deals in surprises. The fact is, that not having any thing new to speak of this week, and remembering being much pleased with his performance of the *Irishman* at the close of this piece the other night (which was all we then saw of it), we take the opportunity of praising an actor, who in most of his characters is not above mediocrity. He has to give an account of a favourite Hibernian exploit, a rescue; and we do not think Mr. Johnstone could have done it better in the most flouri-hing days of his shilelah. In one respect we doubt whether he ever did it so well. We mean, in a certain quaint elastic jump, with which Mr. Connor every now and then accompanies the recollections of his activity, and which gave us, for the first time in our lives, a sensible notion of the meaning of the word bog-trotter. It is like a man accustomed to skip scientifically over a quaking turf. Mr. Connor's brogue is admirably suited to this exhibition, coming, as it does, with true Irish airiness, "trippingly off the tongue." On the other hand, his jovial person and handsome face give the requisite weight to his gallant narrative; which he performs throughout with a mixture of lightness and strength, of quickness and deliberation, of zeal and nonchalance, that keeps the house in constant entertainment, and carries him off with a great deal of merited applause.

We are sorry we cannot speak so well of the fitness of Miss Rosa Corri for the part of her namesake. Her lisp might not be amiss, though it is generally a defect in a singer; neither is she at all deficient in powers; but what disconcerts us in this singer is a kind of hardness and inapprehensiveness, which in the most sensitive situations reduces her skilful performance to a thing of mere crotchets and rests. Singing a song the other night in the Italian style, which is full of passion, she even gave short little dry hems in the intervals, to pluck up her voice, like a person learning at a piano-forte. Common ears, on these occasions, may be taken by a siege of semiquavers; but the effect upon those whose attention is worth having, is, that the singer is executing a task, not giving way to an emotion.

[There has been no new play this week. More of Miss Greene in our next.)

☞

THE QUEEN.

ADDRESSES PRESENTED.

Wednesday being the day appointed by the Queen for the reception of a number of addresses, the road from Hyde-park-corner to Hammersmith was at an early hour thronged by vast bodies of persons. The following were the addresses presented:—From Ely-place Liberty, Holborn, Croydon, Wandsworth, St. Ann's (Limehouse), Farringdon within, Portsoken Ward, Horsleydown, Christ-church (Surrey), Winchester, Oxford, St. Ive's, Hereford, Stockton-on-Trees, Cardiff, Leicester, North Petherton, Taunton, Truro, Sedgeley, Colebrook, Milford, Surrey, Kendal, Ambleside, Kirby Lonsdale, Milnthrop, the Letter-press Printers, Evesham, Manchester, Hinckley, Leeds, Glasgow, United Guildries of Perth, Banff, St. John's (Southwark), and Coventry, and the Benefit Societies of London.

The first address which arrived at Brandenburgh-house was that from the inhabitants of the parish of St. Abbott's, Kensington. The procession consisted of 42 carriages, chiefly filled with ladies of the first respectability. They were elegantly dressed in white, and wore her Majesty's medals suspended from their necklaces. The Queen was in excellent health, and received the deputation in her usual gracious and condescending manner. Her Majesty wore a dress of black silk and spangled velvet, trimmed with roses, under a dress of crape.

Mr. Hume then presented the addresses from Glasgow (signed by 37,000 persons), from the United Guildries of Perth, and from Banff. Major Cartwright, who appeared in the full regimental uniform of the Nottingham Militia, presented the address from the ladies of Manchester, and from the inhabitants of Leeds and Hinckley, in Leicestershire. At half-past two o'clock the deputation from the Ward of Portsoken arrived. The gentlemen who composed it filled 35 coaches and four; the postilions were in new pink dresses with white hats and cockades. In the first carriage was Sir James Shaw, Bart., the Alderman of the Ward.

At three o'clock the procession of the several Benefit Societies of the metropolis arrived. There were more than 4,000 persons in this procession. They appeared to be chiefly artisans and mechanics, and their whole appearance and demeanour did them the highest credit. This procession was accompanied by an immense concourse of people. At the head of each society, the stewards and flags were arranged. This procession took up its position on the lawn, and received her Majesty, who appeared on the balcony, with the loudest acclamations. Many of the Members wore the Medallic Portrait of her Majesty.

The next procession was that of St. Ann's, Limehouse, consisting of ladies and gentlemen, wearing white favours, in open landaus and four; the postilions dressed in crimson jackets. The writer of the Address, Mr. Fitch, the able Master of the Stepney Academy, called the British Lyceum, with many other of the worthy Limehouse Addressors, wore the large Medal of her Majesty, as did many of the Christ Church Addressors.

The Gentlemen deputed from Coventry next appeared, to present her Majesty with some pieces of an elegant new manufactured riband; the colour, Queen's purple, on scarlet ground, combining in its texture the fabrics of sarcenet and damask satin, on which the crown appeared beautifully wrought, and the initials "C. R." Her Majesty accepted the present, and returned a most gracious answer.

The other Addresses were presented to her Majesty by persons connected with the places, or bodies from which they proceeded. The Queen returned answers to all. Her Majesty bore the fatigue of standing so long with great composure, and repeatedly conversed, throughout the day, with Lady A. Hamilton and the Hon. Mrs. Damer, upon the gratifying sight which the grounds around the house presented, thronged as they were with so large a portion of the population of this great city. At no period during the day was there a smaller number than 10,000 persons within the avenues of Brandenburgh-house; they repeatedly hailed their Queen with the most enthusiastic demonstrations of their attachment, which her Majesty as often acknowledged in the most affable manner.

On Tuesday there was a very numerous meeting of St. Andrew's, Holborn, at which a string of very spirited Resolutions in praise of the Queen, and in manly condemnation of the atrocious proceedings against her were passed; as well as an Address voted to her Majesty, expressive of their admiration of her conduct, and their congratulation on the failure of the evidence against her.—Mr. Harmer, after many deserved compliments to Lady Anne Hamilton, for her steady attachment to her Royal Mistress amid the unprincipled scorns and sarcasms of the "great," moved a vote of thanks to that distinguished Lady, which was carried amid enthusiastic applause.

Queen's Evidence.—We accidentally omitted in our last the following statement of William Carrington, the servant of Sir William Gell:—He remembered the Queen visiting Sir William several times when he was confined

to his bed.—The reader remembers what a figure a similar kindness to Bergami made in the Attorney-General's speech. That learned person has shewed a prodigious acquaintance with Italian manners!

Policies were opened on Monday in the City, to return 100 guineas, on the receipt of 10, if the Bill of Pains and Penalties should pass; and at the gambling-houses at the West-end of the town, the odds offered were considerably more.

Observe the opinion of a people totally unbiassed with respect to the present proceedings against the Queen. One American paper, the *National Advocate*, observes, "the total absence of every virtuous and honourable quality in the King, makes them indifferent as to her (the Queen's) continence. His Majesty can obtain witnesses from Milan to impeach a saint, aye, and dog-cheap; he can find men who will swear to any thing, sign any thing, for a *quid pro quo*: how John Bull will swallow such testimony, remains to be seen. The people of this country will look upon these events with curiosity, but with no great interest—happy in having no Kings to get rid of by impeachment or otherwise, or to vitiate public morals by their base examples."—Another American paper, the *Columbian*, observes,—"After all said, the very discussion of the subject among millions of people, the nature of the charges against her, and degree of testimony agitated among all ages, sexes and conditions, are not among the least of the miseries of Royalty. Every child will not only know, but have the charges explained to their satisfaction, and thus be early initiated in the arena of vice."—The *New York Evening Post* remarks, that "the majority in the House of Peers against her proves too plainly that the influence of the King predominates, and nothing but the people will awe the Ministry, together with the Houses of Lords and Commons, and prevent the violations of law and justice."

POLICE.

BOW-STREET.

DISCOVERY OF THE MANUFACTURE OF SEDITIOUS AND TREASONABLE PLACARDS.

Saturday, Oct. 7.

A poor and ignorant boy, Adderfield, was charged with circulating hand-bills of the most treasonable character. The spirit and design of this publication will best appear from its own terms:—

"EVIL BE TO HIM WHO EVIL THINKS.

"The Queen's friends, whenever and however assembled, will not content themselves with empty professions, but give solid proofs of their zeal by effectually promoting the subscription for such a service of plate as may be worthy of this noble country; and show her Majesty's nefarious persecutors that it is not in the power of an infamous government, a corrupt judicature, or bribed majorities—of execrable perjurers, suborners of evidence, or malignant conspirators—to shut the hands of the people of England after they have opened their hearts. Eternal disgrace would be stamped upon the nation if this measure did not thoroughly succeed. Mighty events are probably in the womb of Time. Except from the meritless accidents of sex and primogeniture, what claim has the King upon the nation which the Queen does not possess in common with him? She, as well as he, is only third in generation from one King of England; she is the niece and daughter-in-law of another King; and without preaching any doctrine tending to civil convulsion, the historical truth is undeniable, that England never was greater or happier than in the "golden days of good Queen Bess," and the glorious ones of Queen Anne. Some among the most remorseless of Queen Caroline's enemies might bear in mind that there is an express act of parliament which makes it penal to question the right of the nation to limit the succession to the throne. Whilst the wife, with the magnanimity of a Semiramis, is propounding a system that must shortly regenerate this enslaved land, "and crush the tyrant while it rends the chain," the husband is playing the Dandy. "Nero fiddled when Rome was burning."

"Never will the generous hearts of Englishmen, after the plan has been so promulged of supplying to her Majesty that plate, which, though denied to the niece of George the Third, has been made a boon to her newspaper traducer—never will the public, whose annihilated liberties are sure of resuscitation in the providential instrumentality of this noble-minded Princess (of which, by the way, a recent glorious acquittal even in one of those right arms of tyranny, called courts of law, is auspiciously portentous) —never will the British public permit the dishonour to her cause the plate. Subscriptions continue to be received at the following places, viz."—[Here several newsvenders and others were named; and then a list of the real members of the Queen's Plate Committee.]

"*A passing word on the general cause.*—Even in their festivities the resisters of the detestable government which enslaves this once free nation should not forget those who are now suffering for their past well-proved virtues in the cause. Scaffolds have been the melancholy lot of some. Others are languishing in chains and dungeons. A few weeks only, unless the nation be roused in time, will see two more of our foremost champions "laid in basest bonds" by the corrupt judgment of ermined fiends. A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether, may save us all. Let the regenerators of their country discard all petty jealousies, and keep in mind the motto of that brave people which, by a glorious revolution, cast off a tyrant's sway, and established independence:—*Concordia res parvæ crescunt, discordia maximæ dilabuntur.*"

The prisoner stated, that he could not read, but distributed the bills in question at the request of a gentleman who had given him a shilling for so doing, and promised further to remunerate him.

Mr. MINSHULL was about to fine him 20l. for the offence, when Mr. BIRNIE, with great feeling and humanity, interfered, and said, that as this poor lad, who could neither read nor write, appeared to have been the mere dupe of some designing villain, he thought that the fine ought not to be rigorously exacted. Mr. Pearson, who had been in conversation with Mr. Birnie and Sir Robert Baker, then stepped forward and said, that he appeared there on behalf the Queen's Plate Committee; that he was convinced the statement of the prisoner was correct; that he, Mr. Pearson, knowing the circumstances, had been for the last ten days, night and day, in close pursuit of the publisher of the bill in question, who had already caused upwards of 2,000 to be circulated in crowds through the medium of innocent and ignorant individuals. At Mr. Pearson's suggestion the depositions were taken in a private room, a warrant was granted, and Vickery was dispatched to assist Mr. Pearson in the apprehension of the party charged.—The case was then adjourned.—[Mr. Pearson, having traced the party home to his country residence, about four miles from London, early on Sunday, returned to Vickery, and they both set off together at a very early hour, and surprized the gentleman in his bed. He was brought to London.]

Monday, Oct. 9.

This morning Mr. Hume, Sir G. Noel, Major Cartwright, and several other gentlemen, came into the office soon after ten o'clock. Sir Robert Baker and Mr. Birnie were the magistrates present; Mr. Minshull soon afterwards took his place.

Mr. PEARSON.—Will your Worship proceed now, then, to inquire into the charge upon which I obtained a warrant on Saturday?

Mr. BIRNIE.—I have no objection: let the person charged be brought in.

It was observed by one of the officers that the gentleman was not come.

Sir ROBERT BAKER.—He will be here.

Mr. PEARSON.—I ask you openly whether you have discharged him?

Sir ROBERT BAKER.—He has given securities for his appearance, and he will be here; so you may attend another day.

Mr. PEARSON.—This day was fixed for the purpose, and I wish to know how it is that he is not here?

Sir ROBERT BAKER.—He promised to be here at eleven. It is now past eleven, but he will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. PEARSON.—Then I shall wait for a few minutes.

After a considerable interval,

Mr. PEARSON came forward again and said—I beg leave to state my charges against a person of the name of Franklin, who was apprehended on Sunday morning by Mr. Vickery and myself. Against this person I have several charges, for fabricating and publishing placards, not only recommending sedition and insurrection, but resistance to the Government by force, and for doing all this under the protection and authority of that government. I hold in my hand many of those treasonable papers, issued by this person at various times. I charge him with being at this moment in treasonable conspiracy in the neighbourhood. I call upon you to grant a warrant for searching the house in which I believe him to be. I have been five days and five nights in search of the author of the placard and employer of the poor

boy. I now ask for an officer to search for this person; I charge him with treason; and I say that from this charge he is attempting to run out of the country. I call upon you to use the same means for securing him as you would against an ignorant, a poor, and a seditious person.

Sir Robert Baker.—We have now sent to the man who undertook for his appearance—a very respectable man whom I have long known, and who lives in the neighbouring parish.

Mr. Pearson.—I stated other charges against him to you, Mr. Birnie.

Mr. Birnie.—Yes, you did, in your letter; and I refused on that account to bail him. I am quite sure he will not appear.

Sir Robert Baker.—I know only this—that I discharged him upon the responsibility of a most respectable gentleman who lives in St. Martin's-lane. I have no doubt that he will appear: if he does not, I shall spare no means to apprehend him, not only for this charge, but because he deceived me.

Old Mr. Williams then came forward.

Sir Robert Baker.—Have you seen your friend?

Mr. Williams.—I have not to-day.

Sir Robert Baker.—Will he be here to-day?

Mr. Williams.—Yes, he told me so.

Mr. Birnie.—I never expected that he would appear, and therefore I refused to take bail. What arrangements did you make?

Mr. Williams stated, that yesterday (Sunday) morning he and the accused individual went to No. 6, Berkeley-street, and called at Sir Robert Baker's. They saw Lady Baker, who told them that Sir Robert was probably at the office of Mr. Minshull. They came to that office, but not finding Mr. M., they went back again to Sir Robert Baker's.—He (Mr. Williams) went home and dined with the individual in question, and they parted at ten o'clock at night, it being then agreed that he (Mr. Williams) was to call this morning:—he did call at eight o'clock, but his friend was not at home.

Mr. Williams further said, that the person charged was a Mr. William Franklin, of Clarendon-place, Edgware-road; and that he had a son who was an officer in the guards.

The parties then retired to Mr. Stafford's private room, where the examination of Mr. Williams was continued. Mr. W. resolutely persisted in declaring, that he had not in any way bound himself for Mr. Franklin's appearance; but that he had merely assured Sir Robert Baker of the respectability of the accused, and that he would attend with him in the morning at the office. From the examination of Mr. Williams it appeared that Mr. Franklin was a gentleman of independent fortune, and that he had been on the Sunday with the officer and the prisoner to Mr. Birnie, at his country house, in order to obtain his liberation; but that Mr. Birnie refused to comply with his request, and had advised Mr. Williams, as a friend, not to have any thing to do with the prisoner. In defiance, however, of this advice, he went to Sir R. Baker with the prisoner; and that gentleman discharged him out of custody, upon his promising to appear on the next day.—At this time Mr. Pearson observed that he had received information that Mr. Franklin was, probably, at a house in the neighbourhood; and requested that an officer might be sent with him to search the house. Vickery was appointed to that service. The house in question belongs to a Mr. Dennis O'Bryon; is situated in Craven-street, Strand, and it was represented that that gentleman has, for several years, held a sinecure place under government, worth 800*l.* per annum; and that he is a writer for a morning paper, which advocates the cause of the Ministers.—Information was given at the office that Mr. Franklin had been watched for some days, and has been observed to meet every day, at the house of Mr. Dennis O'Bryan, with some other distinguished characters connected with the ministerial press; and that all the treasonable and seditious hand-bills are carried to that house, and the conspirators admitted by a signal given of drawing a stick along the railing. When Mr. Pearson and Vickery arrived at Craven-street, they were refused admittance by the servant; when Vickery threatened to get in at the window. A gentleman from within, who appeared not to like the aspect of affairs, came out; and the officer took advantage of the door being opened to enter the house, followed by Mr. Pearson. Mr. Dennis O'Bryan soon made his appearance, and declared most vehemently, that he did not even know Mr. Franklin, although Mr. Franklin has been traced into Mr. O'Bryan's house constantly during the last three years, and although Mr. Williams, upon his examination, admitted that he had met the aforesaid Mr. Dennis O'Bryan at this unknown Mr. Franklin's house.

The search of Mr. O'Bryan's house was unsuccessful, and Mr. Pearson returned to the office. During his absence Mr. Haydon contrived to draw some very important facts from Mr. Williams. He admitted that on the Sunday night, so late as 10 o'clock, Mr. Franklin told him that he meant to go out of town, and that that morning, at 8 o'clock, Mr. Franklin's daughter had told him that before twelve o'clock her father would be above 100 miles from London.

Mr. Minshull remarked that it was very singular that not until three o'clock could this gentleman recollect a circumstance so important.

Mr. Pearson, attended by Mr. Haydon, Mr. Wilson, and two other gentlemen, then went to the Secretary of State's office, and had an interview with Mr. Clive, who, very much to the astonishment of the party, had received intelligence of all that had transpired, and was as well acquainted with the mysterious escape of the accused, and all the minutiæ of the case, as were the gentlemen themselves. He further laboured to justify the conduct of Sir Robert Baker, by saying that the charge was only that of a misdemeanour, and that therefore he might let him out at his discretion. Mr. Pearson, in very warm terms, replied to this assertion, that a magistrate had no power to order his discharge without taking good and sufficient bail for his appearance. Mr. Pearson then declared, with great energy, that he made a formal demand for the assistance of the Home Department, and earnestly intreated that the Secretary of State would issue a warrant for the apprehension of the offender, since his warrants were often issued for minor offences. Mr. Pearson further remarked, that the individual in question was charged with the atrocious offence of having, for three years, caused to be printed and distributed hundreds of thousands of placards calculated to betray the lower classes, who were almost driven to desperation by distress alone, into violent actions and their own consequent destruction. Considering these things, and that the person accused had been suffered to escape through the mysterious and unprecedented conduct of Sir R. Baker, the world would draw a very obvious conclusion, if the Home Department did not exert itself.

Mr. Clive said, that Lord Sidmouth was not there, and wished Mr. Pearson to call another day!

The urgency of the case was insisted upon by Mr. Pearson; and at length it was arranged, that he was to call again at the Home Office at half-past four. He did so; and was informed by Mr. Clive, that Lord Sidmouth saw *no reason* for his interference!—Thus the matter ended for the present.

In the evening, Mr. Minshull announced to Mr. Pearson, at his office, that, finding the tale of Adderfield to be true, and that he had been made the dupe of the designs of others, he (Mr. Minshull) had shown compassion to him, and had *only* fined him 5*l.*, and sentenced him to hard labour in the House of Correction for three months!

Tuesday, Oct. 10.

Mr. Pearson applied for a warrant against the author and distributer of a most inflammatory and seditious libel, tending to excite disaffection and rebellion. He begged leave to hand the bill to their worships: it was dated in 1818, on occasion of the elections in Westminster and London, which returned Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Waithman to Parliament. After an allusion to the execution of Brandreth and others in Derby for high treason, it contained these words, on which he particularly founded his application:—"Strike not at all, or strike home. Think of our personal insupportable servitude; and always remember that the alternative is, liberty or a glorious grave."

Mr. Birnie (running his eye along the placard).—You don't mean to prosecute for election-squibs, surely?

Mr. Pearson.—I don't consider that by any means an election-squib. It was never intended for an election-squib. It was written at the time of a general election; but its object was to excite resistance to the Government by force.

Mr. Birnie.—Have you seen this, Sir Robert?

Sir Robert Baker (who seemed to cast his eye carelessly along the paper.)—Yes; it is two years ago.

Mr. Pearson.—It is, Sir Robert; but it is one of a series of more than 30, which I can trace to the same source. I take that at present, because the proof is more ready than of any of the others.

Mr. Birnie.—Is it against the same person?

Mr. Pearson.—It is against the same person.

Mr. Birnie.—Is not one warrant sufficient?

Mr. Pearson.—I apply for this warrant, that we may have one to proceed on, if the other should go to another quarter.

Sir Robert Baker.—Why has the proceeding been delayed so long?

Mr. Pearson.—Because the person could not be found. Rewards were offered in the city for the apprehension of the author, and a prosecution was instituted, but he could not be found. Sir Francis Burdett, too, offered a reward for his apprehension. Your worships may recollect the apprehension of bill-stickers on that occasion; but they could not trace their employer.

The warrant was granted.

[Placards are stuck up, offering 300 guineas reward for the

apprehension of William Franklin, who is represented to be aged 45.

"With respect to the miscreant detected, and suffered to escape on the present occasion, we have some important information; we believe his real name is not *Franklin*, but *Fletcher*; and that he is that person against whom a naval officer of Great Britain, and High-Admiral of the navy of Hayti, obtained damages in a case of adultery. It was one of the most infamous causes that ever came before the Court, *Fletcher* being both the agent of the husband and the seducer of the wife; and the money transmitted to England by that husband suffering a transfer from its rightful owner, as well as the affections of the lady."—*Times.*]

Thursday, Oct. 12.

Mr. Williams was again brought up and examined. He denied that he had had any communication, direct or indirect, with Mr. Franklin, since Sunday last; but he admitted, that his wife had taken in two letters from Mr. Franklin, one on Monday, the other on Tuesday, directed, under cover, to Miss Franklin.—While the examination proceeded,—a Gentleman came in, almost breathless, and said, a letter had just been received from a Gentleman, at Dover, who knew Franklin, and it stated, that the latter was there on Wednesday afternoon, and had procured a passport for France, in the name of Harrison. Mr. Pearson instantly went to Lord Castlereagh's Office, where he applied for, and obtained the promise of, two letters, one to the English Ambassador at the Court of France, and another to the Minister of Passports, in order to the detention of the fugitive. The fact of his having taken out the passport in an assumed name, will be sufficient, under the Code Napoleon, to cause his apprehension in France, and committal for three months to prison.

Mr. Williams stated, that a mob had beset his house on Wednesday evening behaving riotously, and declaring, that he was as bad as the other.

The above particulars are extracted from the Bow-street reports in the morning papers. On Thursday, a letter appeared in the *Times* and *Chronicle*, in which Mr. Denis O'Bryen stated,—1. That he never held a sinecure office, though he allowed that he has a colonial appointment conferred upon him by Lord Grey 14 years ago;—2. That he never had any property, or employment in any newspaper, though an occasional correspondent of several—3. That it is false that distinguished characters connected with the ministerial press are in the habit of meeting at his house;—4. That Mr. Pearson and Vickery were only refused admittance to his house (in consequence of general orders given to the servants arising from annoyances from beggars) until he (Mr. Bryen) learned the object of Vickery, when the house was immediately submitted to search.

On the above statement Mr. Pearson, in a letter to the daily papers, says,—"As the colonial appointment alluded to is a most lucrative situation, and as, if there are any duties belonging to it, they are, or ought to be performed at the Cape of Good Hope; and as Mr. Denis O'Bryen has enjoyed the benefits of the appointment of 17 years, and has not, I believe, been ever near the Cape, I should have conceived myself justified in calling the situation a sinecure place."

"Mr. O'Bryen says that he is an occasional Correspondent of different Morning papers. I know this fact well; and I know also full well what description of articles it is which he furnishes to one of these papers. Perhaps Mr. Denis O'Bryen may yet blush at the recollection of having called his Queen *a hag*, nye, and that too, within a day or two of the time when there were issued from his house certain hand-bills calculated to involve in a charge of treason and sedition, her Majesty and her friends. Mr. O'Bryen is not the Editor of the *Morning Post*. No, no. Mr. O'Bryen has been in the Colonial Department too long to put himself thus in jeopardy. But what if it shall appear that Mr. Denis O'Bryen should turn out to be the writer of virulent invectives against the Reformers for the imputed publication of treasonable hand-bills, and that those hand-bills should be traced to and from the depot in Craven-street?

"Mr. O'Bryen, although I accurately described to him the personal appearance of Mr. Franklin, and mentioned the time when he had been at his house, assured me positively that he did not know the man; and, after twelve hours' reflection, told Mr. Birnie, the Magistrate, the same."

"I am now setting off by the mail in pursuit of Mr. Franklin. If I were to waste longer time upon Mr. Denis O'Bryen's letter I might contribute to the object which he had in view in writing it. I have heard of a "rub being thrown out to the whale," but nothing that Mr. O'Bryen can write shall divert my attention from the object of catching his friend and associate, Mr. Fletcher, alias Mr. Franklin, alias Mr. Forbes, being the opponent of both one and the other, as long as I am

"CHARLES PEARSON."

MR. HAYDON'S PICTURE of CHRIST'S ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM IS OPEN, from Ten to Five, with all his other Pictures and Drawings, at BULLOCK'S MUSEUM, Piccadilly; to which is added, a Study of a SLEEPING GIRL.

Admittance 1s.—Catalogue 6d.

MEDALLIC PORTRAIT OF HER MAJESTY.

A MEDAL of the QUEEN, engraved by Mr. MILLS, from a Model recently taken from the Life by Mr. ROUW, is just now published at the Medallic Cabinet, 158, Strand, price 12s. in Bronze, and 6s. 6d in Tin. The Tin are perforated to wear at the breast.

It is respectfully suggested to the Ladies and Gentlemen who go up with Addresses to the Queen, that they cannot well pay her Majesty a greater Compliment than by wearing her Medallic Portrait on such occasions.

NEW INVENTED MEDALLION WAFERS.

MESSRS. J. and H. THOMPSON, No. 1, Wellington-street, Waterloo-bridge, Strand, beg leave respectfully to inform the Nobility and Gentry, that they have recently invented a new species of WAFERS, of a very elegant and superior description. They possess all the beauty of the Cameo, have the adhesive quality of wax, and close a note or letter with the facility and security of a wafer. Messrs. T. have on sale a considerable number of Devices, which, being variously coloured, and on grounds of different tints, exhibit the delicacy and taste of this novel invention to perfection.

ANGEL HOUSE, HAMMERSMITH.

MISS JACKSON'S ESTABLISHMENT.—YOUNG LADIES are genteely Boarded, and Educated in the English and French Languages, Geography, History, useful and ornamental Needle-works, &c. at Twenty-five Guineas per annum. Masters of the first respectability attend the Establishment; and Parents may rest assured, that the strictest attention is paid to the health, morals, and personal as well as mental improvement of the Scholars. Respectable references will be given to the Friends of her present Pupils.

Application (if by Letter post paid) to Mrs. Davies, No. 108, New Bond-street; and to Mrs. Scott, 30, Kirby-street, Hatton-garden.

A Half-boarder wanted; and two Ladies of respectability can be accomodated as Boarders—Terms. Fifty Guineas.

To-morrow, price 1s.

A GROAN FROM THE THRONE!!

Broadway, Ludgate-hill, October 15.

On Wednesday next will be published, price 2d. No. 2. of Vol. II. of THE INDICATOR, a Weekly Publication on all topics not connected with News, Politics, or Religion. The subjects chiefly consist of curious Recollections of Biography; Essays, serious and lively, on Men, Manners, and Things; the most interesting or least known Stories in History or Fiction, told over again; and occasionally some original Verses and Poetical Translations. One object of this periodical work is, to convey to persons of classical taste, who have not had access to the stores of literature, the results of the reading of one who has. The best idea of the character of the publication will perhaps be given by the following list of the subjects already treated of:—

A Mistake of Mr. Thomas Paine's on Learning—Difficulty of finding a name for a work of this kind—Some account of Venice and the Venetians—The Beau Miser, and what happened to him at Brighton—To any one whom bad Weather depresses—Mists and Fogs—To the Lares on the commencement of Fires—Fatal Mistake of Nervous Disorders for Insanity—Anglers—Literary Recollections of London—Charles Brandon and Mary Queen of France—On the Household Gods of the Ancients—The Shoemaker of Veyros—A Tale for a Chimney-corner—Thieves, ancient and modern—A few Thoughts on Sleep—The Fair Revenge—Getting up on Cold Mornings—All London or No London, a tale—Character of an Old Gentleman—An Account of the Origin and Meaning of Christian Names, as well as of the signification of various Greek and Latin names—Ronald of the Perfect Hand—Hats, New and Ancient—Seamen on Shore—Spring—Daisies—Rousseau's Pygmalion—Duel between the Nightingale and the Musician—Cephalus and Procris—On the varieties and merits of Sticks—On Shops—The Story of the Daughter of Hippocrates—A Rainy Day—Now, being a Description of Hot Weather—The Venetian Girl—The Egyptian Thief.—Tragedy of the Cenci—Mr. Keats's new Poems, Lamia, Isabella, &c.—Farinetta and Farinonna, a Tale—Coaches and their Horses—The Hamadryad—Translation of a curious Italian Poem—The Nurture of Triptolemus—The Return of Autumn, &c.

Orders received by the Booksellers, Newsmen, and by the Publisher, J. Appleyard, 19, Catherine-street, Strand.

N.B. The first Eight Numbers having been re-printed, complete sets may now be had.—The first volume is ready.

BIRTH.

On the 9th inst. the Lady of John Mattocks, Esq. of Vron, in Denbighshire, of a son and heir.

MARRIAGE.

On Wednesday last, at St James's Church, George William Rowley, Esq. second son of O. Rowley, Esq. of the Priory, St. Neot's, Huntingdonshire, to Jane Catherine, only daughter of the late J. Maine, Esq. and niece of the late J. Dawson, Esq. of Burlington-street.

DEATH.

On the 3d inst. at Chelsea, aged 24, Louisa, daughter of George Barron, Esq. of the Ordnance Department.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER-Office, 19, Catherine Street, Strand.—Price 10d.